

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1873.

ART. I.—INFIDELITY—ITS PRINCIPLES.

BY REV. D. Y. HEISLER, A. M., MONT ALTO, PA.

COMMON prudence suggests, that, in reference to all the higher interests of life, we carefully ponder the paths of our feet. Otherwise, we act irrationally. It is, indeed, the legitimate province of reason thoroughly to investigate any and every subject claiming our attention, and on the acceptance or rejection of which weighty and important interests are suspended. Before passing judgment, or coming to a final decision, therefore, our convictions should be so strong and clear as to render the correctness of our sentiments and the safety of our course morally certain. And where the nature of the subject is such as to require immediate attention, and to call for a positive answer, one way or the other, the observance of this rule is of peculiar importance.

Now, in virtue of our intellectual and moral constitution, as well as by reason of our social position, and the diversified relations of life which it involves, men will always adopt, and, in fact, must adopt some kind of religious belief, and shape their life and conduct more or less in accordance with this cherished

faith. What precisely this religious belief and practice shall be, depends very much on circumstances—on our social and civil relations, on constitutional peculiarities, and especially on early associations and family training. But we may lay it down as a general and well-established rule, that, everywhere and under all conceivable circumstances, men will have some kind of religion, either true or false; and that, by virtue of an inward necessity, they will be more or less influenced by their favorite systems of thought and belief. Even for the present life, some kind of religion is necessary; without it, men would sink, hopelessly and in despair, beneath the accumulated mass and overwhelming burden of human ills. We need some prop to stay up and support our sinking spirits—some soothing cordial to allay our sorrows and dry up the bitter fountain of our tears. This prop is religion—this soothing cordial a cherished hope!

If, indeed, we are more than brutes, and have hopes and aspirations higher and holier than those of mere animals, then it naturally and necessarily follows, that, in some way or other, we seek to realize these hopes, and cherish these higher and holier aspirations. This spiritual effort constitutes the human element in religion—a movement upwards—a conscious relinking of the soul to God, the universal ground and source of its being! This effort, to realize what, by reason of our religious nature, belongs to us, can be put forth in two ways only—either, first, on the ground of mere nature, and so constitute natural religion, that is Paganism or infidelity; or, secondly, on the ground of a foreign supernatural mediation, and so pass over into the sphere of revealed religion, that is Christianity—the religion of the Bible.

Such a supernatural system of religion belonged already, incipiently at least, and in the way of type and shadow, to the ancient people of God—the Israelites; while the gentile world proceeded universally on the ground of mere nature. In modern times, or since the introduction of Christianity, substantially the same systems still prevail—the only difference being, that Judaism, or the religion of types and shadows, has

been superceded by the true substance, or the fulfillment of these types and shadows in the person of Jesus Christ—in the mystery of the incarnation; while Paganism has, in civilized and Christian countries, assumed the more subtile and refined forms of Deism, modern infidelity, or practical Atheism.

Now, what the Jewish Law-giver most truly and strikingly said respecting the abettors of heathenism, in his day, that, we think, can be said still more confidently respecting the abettors of Deism or modern Infidelity, in the present day—"Their Rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being judges."

We propose, accordingly, to inquire into the comparative merits of these two systems of faith and practice—the Christian and the infidel—by contrasting the teachings of the two systems, respectively, on a few of the leading questions which pertain most essentially to our present and future well-being. And we now venture to assert, that, in the prosecution of our design, we shall be able to show conclusively, from the published sentiments of Infidels themselves, that "Their Rock is *not* as our Rock"—that there is, in fact, an infinite disparity between the two systems on all the leading questions of morals and religion, that the doctrines of the Christian system as far transcend the teachings of infidelity, in point of purity and excellence, as the splendor of the noon-day sun exceeds the flicker of a taper, or as the peerless gems in a royal diadem surpass, in beauty and brilliancy, the mountain rock or common quartz.

In the process of argumentation, we shall on each point, first give a condensed statement of the teachings of Divine Revelation, the faith of the simple-hearted Christian; and then contrast with these statements the published sentiments of Infidels, both ancient and modern.

And, first, as regards the being and perfections of God, and His relation to the world—what is the voice of Christianity? In reference to this point the Scriptures teach, and Christians believe, that there is but one living and true God—infinite in nature and perfections—spiritual and invisible; without body,

parts, or passions; immense, eternal and omnipotent: "The Father of lights, with whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning"—most holy, just, and only wise, "working all things according to the counsel of His own will"—gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth; the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him, and the avenger of wrong.

Such is the character of the Supreme Being, as represented in the Holy Scriptures; and His relation to the world is that of the Creator and Preserver of all things "visible and invisible," by whose paternal bounty and goodness the wants of all living creatures, rational and irrational, are daily and hourly satisfied. "Like as a father pitieth his children," says the Psalmist, "so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him." And in another place, he expresses it thus: "The eyes of all wait upon Thee, Lord, and Thou givest them their meat in due season."

And what is the language of natural religion, or Paganism and Infidelity, on this all-important subject? What have they to say respecting God and His relation to the world?

It is extremely difficult, and perhaps impossible, to form a clear conception of what is taught by the advocates of nature and natural religion, as there is among them an endless diversity of opinions; but we may observe, in a general way, that before the light of revelation had taught men better things, Polytheism, or the belief in many gods, was almost universally prevalent in the world. Even where there was something like an approach to the doctrine of God's unity, it usually degenerated into a kind of cheerless pantheism or deification of the entire universe, and the consequent denial of a personal God or supreme intelligence, and the substitution, in His place, of an abstract impersonal world-spirit, a blind force or fate! This spirit was supposed to be equally present in all persons, places, and things—in the stars, and plants, and trees—in men, birds, and beasts, and creeping things; and hence each and all of these became, in turn, the objects of divine worship. And this senseless and degrading idolatry was not confined to the ignorant and vulgar only. Even the most intelligent and best of

men—the eminent and world-renowned sages of ancient Greece and Rome, had but very confused and imperfect ideas concerning the Supreme Being, and the worship that became Him. So likewise in the Orient, the great mass of the people worshiped an untold number of deities, under all imaginable shapes and forms. The ancient Persians are said to have had twelve principal divinities, with a vast multitude of subordinate ones, each of which had a place in their affections, while their chief worship was offered to the sun, moon, and stars—symbols, possibly, or impersonations of the god of fire. Hence their most ardent devotions and best offices were tendered to the “hosts of heaven.” The refined and classic taste of the ancient Greeks had deified all the social and civil virtues, graces, times, and seasons, and peopled heaven, and earth, and seas with their imaginary deities. In Imperial Rome—the proud and stately mistress of the world—the popular devotions were daily offered up at the consecrated shrines of her thirty thousand gods or more; while in Africa, and some of the South Sea Islands, the most costly gifts and sacrifices, extending even to human victims, were constantly offered in solemn service to the devil—the great spirit whom they adored—either to appease his anger and avert some impending evil, or to secure his aid and kindly offices. Multitudes of such wretched victims were daily brought, and laid, mangled and bleeding, upon the smoking altars of their insatiate divinities; and all this in the vain hope of propitiating the great world-spirit, and securing his favor and benediction!

Such is a faint and imperfect sketch of the ancient Heathen world; many of whose most prominent and characteristic features are still prevalent in different portions of the globe, as yet unvisited and unilluminated by the glorious light of the gospel. The picture shows us what man is by nature and without “the blessed gospel of the grace of God.” As regards doctrine, modern Infidelity is not much in advance of its ancient compeer. Practically, indeed, the picture does not look quite so dark and cheerless as the one which we have just sketched; but this improvement is the result of a general dif-

fusion of Christian principles, and the almost universal prevalence and operation of these higher and holier "powers of the world to come," and not of any material change in the system itself. In its own nature, or in and of itself, infidelity is just as bad now as it ever was; and its advocates of the present day, really, are just as devoid of principle, and of the nobler instincts of our nature generally, as those of any former period. Professedly, indeed, they reject the doctrine of a plurality of gods, and claim pre-eminently to be in favor of one Supreme Intelligence. But when you question them closely as to what they believe concerning the nature and perfections of the Supreme Being, their answers are as numerous and as diversified as the tongues from which they proceed. The Rationalists of Germany, the Deists of England, and the Atheists of France, as well as the skeptical scientists of more recent date, are all equally at a loss to say what exactly is the character of God and His relation to the world; and it is a notorious fact, ominously significant, that Infidels generally, or shall we say universally, are far more deeply and anxiously concerned about the gratification of their brutal lusts and passions than the worship and honor of God!

As regards the doctrine of creation, their sentiments are equally unsatisfactory. Some hold, with the ancients, that the world is eternal and uncreated; others that it sprang into being, and attained its present beautiful order and regularity of motion, by mere chance; and others, again, assert that it gradually grew into its present form by a certain mysterious process of nature, together with all its inhabitants. Man—the prince of creation—came, thus, according to Monbodda and Buffon, by gradual improvement from the monkey or baboon; and Dr. Darwin, an English physician of great eminence, dives still deeper into the mysteries of nature and of nature's processes, and bravely tells us that man's ancestry dates back as far as the oyster, at *least*, if not away beyond that, to a species of the most minute corpuscles formed at the bottom of the ocean, and thence, after ages of preliminary lingering in secret, gradually ascending in the scale of being, by successive improve-

ments, until eventually each stood forth to view a full-grown man *or* woman, "with form erect and god-like mien."

And this is that superior glory of the higher philosophy—the sweet efflorescence of human wisdom and infidel speculation—the boasted discovery of that lofty and superior intelligence which deems the Bible unnecessary, and scoffingly derides and denounces its simple and unadorned account of the creation as absurd and visionary!

If, now, we bring this learned nonsense and absurd speculation up alongside of the Christian's simple, pure, and child-like faith in a Supreme Being—infinite in excellence, benignity, wisdom, power and majesty—the creator and upholder of all things—a "Father of the fatherless, and a husband to the widow," are we not fully justified in saying, that in this respect at least, "their Rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being judges?"

There is, in fact, not one redeeming quality—not a single consoling feature—in the infidel's creed. All is but a dreary, doleful, barren waste, on which not a solitary flower is seen to bloom. His God, if indeed he has any, is away off beyond the clouds—totally unconcerned about the affairs of men. His boasted belief in a Supreme Intelligence is wholly abstract, cold and chilly as a floating iceberg. Far more real, pure and comforting is the Christian's faith. In it there is a glow of generous love and sweet complacence. He feels that God is near at hand, "seeing that He giveth to all life, and breath, and all things." Calmly and confidently does he look up to God, calling Him "Abba, Father." Divine Providence is to him something real and consoling—the in-being in the world's history of God Himself, "for in Him we live, and move, and have our being." So near and dear unto us is God, so intimately are we related to Him, and so strong is our confidence, and so real and precious our interest, in the Almighty, that, according to the beautiful saying of the Apostle, our "life is hid with Christ in God; when, therefore, Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with Him in Glory." We are thus closely identified with God in nature, interest, and

honor ; as another Apostle, St. John, the seer, also very beautifully says : “ Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be ; but we know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him ; for we shall see Him as He is. And every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself, even as He is pure.”

Having disposed of the question concerning the existence and character of God, let us inquire, secondly, as to what constitutes, in the view of these respective systems, man’s chief good, or the nature and properties of true happiness, and the means necessary for its attainment.

It is acknowledged, on all hands, that the desire of happiness is universal ; and it is equally clear, we think, that in and of itself this desire is perfectly right and proper. It belongs legitimately to our original nature, as this came from the hands of God, and is accordingly admitted by all classes of men, universally, to be innocent and allowable, or even praiseworthy. But, when we come to inquire into the nature and properties of that happiness which is the object of this universally prevalent and ardent desire, and the course of conduct necessary for its attainment, the answers are greatly at variance, and sometimes even perfectly contradictory.

David says : “ There be many that say, who will show us any good ? ” to which he responds, in the form of a prayer, “ Lord, lift Thou up the light of Thy countenance upon us ; ” thus intimating that HE esteems the favor of God as the *summum bonum*—the chief good of man. In accordance with this sentiment, he says, in a different connection : “ One thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after ; that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in His temple ; for in the time of trouble He shall hide me in His pavilion ; in the secret place of his tabernacle shall He hide me ; He shall set me up upon a rock. Therefore, will I offer in His tabernacle sacrifices of joy ; I will sing, yea, I will sing praises unto the Lord.”

Such is the language of the “ sweet singer of Israel ” in reference to the nature of true happiness. How is it to be at-

tained? "Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" was the question proposed to our Lord by a young man, kneeling at His feet, to whom Jesus replied: "Keep the commandments." And 'when,' on a different though somewhat similar occasion, it was demanded of Him: "Which is the great commandment in the law?" He answered: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang the whole Law and the Prophets." John says that "God is light," and that, "if we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin." He adds: "These things I write unto you that ye sin not; and if any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world."

According to these citations from the Holy Scriptures, it appears that Christianity places happiness in that purity of heart and life which both springs from and encourages communion with God and fellowship of men one with another, through the mediation of Jesus Christ. This view of salvation requires and encourages genuine devotion, disinterested friendship, virtue, and "holiness," especially, "without which no man shall see the Lord."

And what answer does Infidelity return to the question concerning man's chief good and the means for its attainment? Here again is found an endless variety. For, while some place happiness in a stoical indifference to passing events, and, in fact, to all merely outward circumstances; others adopt precisely the opposite view, and make happiness to consist almost exclusively in external circumstances—in eating and drinking, and making merry. Others again, especially among the ancients, imagined happiness to consist in the free indulgence of the sensual appetites, or mere pleasure and present enjoyment, and so on to the end of the chapter. "Cicero informs us that

there was so great a dissension among the philosophers that it was almost impossible to enumerate their different sentiments,—that, while one sect affirmed that virtue was the sole good and its own reward, another rejected that notion in the case of virtue in distress, and made the good things of this life a necessary ingredient of happiness; and a third set up pleasure, or at least indolence and freedom from pain, as the final good which men ought to propose to themselves." On these confused and discordant opinions, Cicero very justly remarks that "they who do not agree in stating what is the chief end or good, must of course differ in the whole system of precepts for the conduct of life."

These remarks of the Roman sage—the eloquent orator and statesman—apply with equal justice and propriety to the discordant sentiments of modern infidelity, and we shall see that, as its advocates have no just and proper conception of man's dignity, or the true end and object of life, and consequently fail to discover the nature of true happiness and the course of conduct necessary for its attainment, so also have they no just and adequate conception of genuine virtue or piety, and hence have introduced an endless confusion into the sphere of morals and religion. When happiness is made to consist in sensual gratification, then, of course, there will be no room for the existence and cultivation of exalted virtues and noble sentiments. And then, correspondent with these low and unworthy sentiments will also be the general conduct of men in all ages of the world. Hence there is, in reality, a most intimate and wonderful correspondence between ancient heathenism and modern infidelity, both in principle and in practice. Let us briefly review these principles of life and conduct, and see how far they will go in leading men to the true end of life—the attainment of genuine happiness. What were the sentiments—the principles and practices—of the ancients?

Their principles of philosophy were in most cases notoriously false, and their morals corrupt, and even their religious rites and ceremonies infamous and abhorrent. Suicide, in certain cases, was not only allowed, but openly encouraged and com-

mended. Lying or prevarication had a similar license, and was even deemed virtuous under certain circumstances. Malice, revenge, cruelty to servants, the exposure of helpless infants, and abuse of woman, were all of them extensively practiced, and allowed by the public authorities. Seneca, who ranks among the best and wisest of the ancients, pleads for self-destruction in all cases where life becomes burdensome. "If thy mind be melancholy and in trouble," says he, "thou mayest put a period to this wretched state. Wherever thou lookest there is an end to it. See that precipice; there thou mayest have liberty. Seest thou that sea, that river, that well? Liberty is at the bottom of it. That little tree? Freedom hangs upon its branches. Thine own neck, thine own throat, may be a refuge for thee from such servitude; yea, every vein in thy body." So, likewise, *theft* was publicly sanctioned, both in Egypt and Sparta—on the ground, possibly, that it sharpened men's wits and made them "smart." You may say that this is ancient heathenism, while we are just now concerned with modern infidelity. Very well. We shall now proceed to show that while many things have changed and have assumed new shapes, either of beauty or of deformity, infidelity, or natural religion, as to its main features, is very much the same as it was in the days of Seneca and Cicero. Its most essential principles are just as corrupt and demoralizing now as formerly, and its resources for improvement as scant and inefficient as ever. In fact Nature can never rise above its own proper level; and hence natural religion, whether in the form of ancient heathenism or modern infidelity, can never lift itself and its advocates out of the sphere of the flesh. Its case is a hopeless one, both as regards its principles and its practices. Its teachings always have been, and always will be, demoralizing—destructive. Let us hear a few of the sentiments expressed by the champions of modern Infidelity, Deism, or practical Atheism:

LORD HERBERT declared "that the indulgence of lust and of anger is no more to be blamed than the thirst occasioned by the dropsy or the drowsiness produced by lethargy."

BOLINGBROKE asserts "that the chief end of man is to gratify the appetites and inclinations of the flesh ; that modesty is inspired by mere prejudice ; that polygamy is a part of the law or religion of nature ; and that there is no wrong except in the highest lewdness."

HUME maintained that self-denial, self-mortification, and humility are not virtues, but are useless and mischievous ; that adultery *must* be practiced if men would obtain all the advantages of life ; that, if generally practiced, it would in time cease to be scandalous ; and that, if practiced secretly and frequently, it would by degrees come to be thought no crime at all."

VOLTAIRE AND HELVETIUS advocated "the unlimited gratification of the sensual appetites ; and the latter held that it is not agreeable to policy, to regard gallantry, or sensualism, as a vice in a moral sense ; and that, if men will call it a vice, it must be acknowledged that there are vices which are useful in certain ages and countries."

These sentiments, which were promulgated, originally, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, by some of the leading infidels of England and France, and, coming up again, fruited and flourished anew during the latter part of the past and the early part of the present century, are sufficient to show how uniformly they place human happiness as man's chief end in the gratification of the sensual appetites. However much they may differ, in other respects, on this one subject they all agree. In order to show that in reference to the essential principles of religion and morals, they were no less deficient, we shall cite a few more passages having reference especially to this point. One declares that "self-love is the great law of nature ;" another, that "it is unreasonable to believe God to be wise and good ;" a third, that "nothing can be more fatal to virtue than the weak and uncertain belief in future rewards and punishments ;" and a fourth, that "man is a mere machine," and that "the soul is material and mortal." And, in one of the sessions of the national council of France, in the days of its infidelity, or atheism, rather, it was solemnly decreed that "God is nothing," and "death an eternal sleep."

During this period of national unbelief and senseless infatuation—this reign of terror—"public worship was utterly abolished," and "the churches converted into temples of reason."

Such, briefly, were the principles of religion and morality promulgated by the infidel schools of England and France, and such their idea of man's chief good, and of the course of life to be pursued for its attainment; and such substantially are the principles and practices still advocated by the enemies of Divine Revelation. The outward form may have changed, but the inner life and substance are precisely the same. If, accordingly, we were to propose to one of these modern skeptics the question: "What is thy only comfort in life and death?" we should, doubtless be answered thus: "My only comfort, sir, is to be wholly and absolutely my own master; to eat, drink and be merry; to gratify my fleshly appetite; believe God to be nothing, and death an eternal sleep;—this, sir, is my only comfort." Should we, now, turn to one of the little children of the church and ask: "What is *thy* only comfort in life and death?" that simple-hearted child would sweetly answer: "That I with body and soul, both in life and death, am not my own, but belong unto my faithful Saviour Jesus Christ, who, with His precious blood, hath fully satisfied for all my sins, and delivered me from all the power of the devil; and so preserves me, that, without the will of my heavenly Father, not a hair can fall from my head; yea, that all things must be subservient to my salvation; and, therefore, by His Holy Spirit, He also assures me of eternal life, and makes me sincerely willing and ready henceforth to live unto Him;" adding—"this, sir, is my only comfort in life and death." It will require but a small share of discrimination, we think, and still less of courage, to decide at once as to which of the above answers proves the more comforting, and, consequently, merits our preference!

We proceed, thirdly, to inquire as to the soul's immortality, and the certainty of a future life;—what are the teachings of the two systems, respectively, on these vital points?

Christianity speaks out its sentiments clearly and distinctly, and with the utmost confidence. It gives us full assurance of that which all would fain wish to be true. It has no uncertain sound—no hesitation. It speaks right up to the point, and positively asserts both the immortality of the soul and a future life of blessedness—including the resurrection of the body. "For, if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him." It encourages men to "look for a city which hath foundations, whose maker and builder is God." It disarms death, and sheds light and beauty over the grave; for its garnered denizens are not dead, but asleep—"asleep in Jesus." It points the weary pilgrim to mansions of inimitable beauty in the skies; "For we know, that, if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

These are the sentiments, the hopes and aspirations, which Christianity puts into the lips of its friends and professors. What is the language of Infidelity on this subject? What has it to say for itself and its advocates?

Scarcely, indeed, can its feeble voice be heard, being both uncertain and tremulous. It knows absolutely nothing of that joyous confidence, that blessed hope, and those brilliant anticipations of future glory, which belong to the religion of Christ. It has, indeed, always had some in its ranks, who, amidst the general desolation, felt the strong impulses of an immortal life within, and have, in different ways, given expression to these loftier and nobler sentiments. Especially may this be said of the ancients—those immortal heroes and "seekers after truth" in the hoary past. But, in most cases, even the honored sages of Greece and Rome have spoken with painful hesitation, and often in gloomy despair. Let us briefly advert to their own sentiments for illustration. Socrates, the acknowledged prince of philosophers, expressed himself in the most cautious and doubtful terms concerning the soul's immortality and a future life of blessedness. Thus, shortly before his death, he said to his sorrowing friends: "I hope I am now going to good men,

though this I would not take upon me positively to assert ; but I am in good hope that there is something remaining for those who are dead, and that it will then be much better for good than for bad men." What has been said of Socrates, observes Mr. Horne, "may in a great measure be applied to Plato, the most eminent of his disciples." Both exhibited the same hesitancy and painful uncertainty. And Cicero, who stands pre-eminent among those who argued for the immortality of the soul, "labors under the same uncertainty that distressed *their* minds." After stating the several opinions advocated, he says very characteristically and sadly : "Which of these is true, God alone knows ; and which is most probable, is a very great question." On all of which Seneca observes, that "immortality, however desirable, is rather promised than proved by those great men." And Horne, after detailing the statements of these ancient worthies, goes on to say that, "while the followers of these great philosophers were thus perplexed with doubt, others of the heathen entertained the most gloomy notions—imagining either that they should be removed from one body to another, and be perpetual wanderers, or contemplating the grave as their eternal habitation, and sadly complaining that the sun and stars could set and rise again, but that man, when his day was set, must lie down in darkness, and sleep a perpetual sleep." The same idea is also plaintively expressed by one of the Greek poets, thus :

"Alas! the tender herbs, and flowery tribes,
Though crushed by winter's unrelenting hand,
Revive and rise when vernal zephyrs call ;
But we, the brave, the mighty, and the wise,
Bloom, flourish, fade, and fall ; and then succeeds
A long, long, silent, dark, oblivious sleep :
A sleep, which no propitious Pow'r dispels,
Nor changing seasons, nor revolving years."

So sang the Attic poet ; and his melancholy strains remind one of the mournfully sweet and beautiful Elegy of Horace, who, when his locks were whitening for the grave, sang out in elegant and pathetic verse the dearest hopes of his own warm and

feeling heart. And what were these cherished hopes and pleasing anticipations of the good and warm-hearted poet? Not that he would shortly be the companion of angels and of the spirits of just men made perfect in heaven, but that he expected to become incarnate, and soar aloft high above the heads of the vulgar crowd, in the body of a beautiful "white swan;" and, even for this poor, chilling, dismal hope, and paltry lot, the only evidences were his snowy locks and the frost-like down upon his withered arms and hands!

We have detained our readers so long with recitals from the sages of antiquity in order to show how far honest and sincere inquirers after truth could go without the light of Divine Revelation. All these men sought earnestly and persistently after the truth; and, no doubt, they would gladly have embraced "the truth as it is in Jesus," had it been published among them. Indeed, one of them expressed the fond hope that God would, at some future time, make such a revelation of Himself and of a future life, as would satisfy the sincere inquirer, and safely conduct him to the realms of peace. Before leaving these honest and earnest seekers after wisdom, we will yet quote the dying words of the great and good Socrates, and contrast them with the words of St. Paul, under similar circumstances. "I am going out of the world," said the great philosopher to his friends, "but which of us has the better part, is a secret to every one but God." St. Paul, writing from prison to his beloved Timothy, in the immediate prospect of death, says: "I am now ready to be offered up, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight. I have finished my course. I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give unto me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing." Here, in brief, are the dying sentiments of two great men, representative and of world-wide reputation—the one a pagan, the other a Christian Philosopher; both are presumed to have been equally learned, earnest, and sincere; but the one speaks with painful uncertainty of a future life—the other with unshaken confidence, and holy triumph and exultation.

But we must pass on to another and less generous class of men—the champions of modern infidelity and practical atheism. What have they to tell us of the soul's immortality, and of a blessed life to come? What encouragement can they afford the suffering sons of sorrow? What comfort have they for the "weary and heavy laden?" What balm for the bleeding heart? What cordial for the broken spirit? What rest for the feet of the weary pilgrim? Let us inquire at their own mouth, and learn the answer from their own lips. Listen to their gloomy deliverances:

SHAFTESBURY, one of the most eminent of the British skeptics, affirms, as we have already seen, that "nothing can be more fatal to virtue than the weak and uncertain belief of future rewards and punishments." This would seem to intimate that *he* is the best and most virtuous of men, who can die like a brute and stolidly contemplate, in the grave, the monotony of an eternal sleep. For, if there is no hereafter, then death is the end of man—the last sad and mournful event in his cheerless history! No comfort here for the weary pilgrim, who, burdened and care-worn, lingers not on all his painful journey that he may the sooner receive his reward, and be for ever at rest in the land of promise!

MR. COLLINS teaches that "man is a mere machine," and that "the soul is material and mortal." He thus denies positively not only the existence of a future state, but even its very possibility, and sinks man at once to the low level of the brute creation. This heartless skeptic gives a death-blow to all the better hopes and aspirations of mankind, and leads the dying sons of men, uncheered and comfortless, to the regions of the dead. He knows apparently nothing of the blessed boon of life and immortality in the world to come.

MR. CHUBB holds that the "resurrection of Christ, if true, proves not the immortality of the soul"—that "the belief of a future state is of no advantage to society"—that "all religions are alike," and that, therefore, "it is of no consequence what religion a man embraces." In the view of this sagacious writer the gloomy superstitions of heathenism, and the boasted specu-

lations of infidelity are of equal value with the blessed Gospel of Christ and its future inheritance "among the saints in light."

BOLINGBROKE asserts "that God does not concern Himself about the affairs of men at all—that the soul is material and mortal, and that self-love is the great law of our nature." This noble lord brings us still deeper into the cold and dismal regions of unbelief. He not only denies a hereafter, but also shuts out the light of God's countenance even from our present habitation—"He concerns Himself not about the affairs of men." This eminent and learned skeptic seems never to have heard of the faith which teaches us to look up to heaven with child-like confidence, and say: "Abba, Father."

HUME goes still farther, and declares that "there are no solid arguments to prove the existence of God"—that "it is unreasonable to believe God to be wise and good," supposing Him to exist—and that "no reward or punishment can be rationally expected beyond what is already known by experience and observation." This is still worse, and more hopelessly gloomy and cheerless; reminding us of another skeptic of the same stamp, who is said to have died with this horrid prayer in his mouth: "If there is a God, I desire that He may have mercy upon me." How different is this dying scene from the triumphant death of the martyr Stephen, who, "being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God; and Jesus standing at the right hand of God; and said, behold, I see the heavens open, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God; and they stoned Stephen, calling upon God and saying: Lord Jesus, receive my spirit; and, when he had said this, he kneeled down, and fell asleep." So dies the good man, calm, bright, and serene as the setting sun!

We will here close our citations from these heartless skeptics, who, in their aims and efforts, agree in nothing so fully as in the total subversion of all religion, and in the extinction of all our better hopes and aspirations; whose only object seems to have been to make life as infamous as possible, and death as

gloomy and horrid as language could render it. The beautiful garden of the Lord must, if possible, be laid waste, every living plant and smiling flower destroyed, and their beauty and fragrance scattered to the winds or trodden in the dust.

So much for infidelity, its principles and its advocates. Much more might be said to show up its infamous and perilous character; but enough, we think, has been advanced to convince any unprejudiced mind that infidels are not just the best and the wisest men in the world, nor the safest leaders of the people; that their principles are, in fact, infamous and desolating, and wholly unsafe in their practical operations; and that, in every view of the case, "their rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being judges;" that their boasted system has nothing in it to adorn and beautify human life, to elevate and improve society, to cheer the comfortless and afflicted ones, to sooth the sorrows of life, or give assurance in death; while Christianity possesses all these ingredients, and many more besides. It encourages, comforts, and sustains the living, and binds on the pallid brow of the dying saint the fadeless wreath of immortality.

Let us briefly illustrate this difference in the two systems. The year 1778 witnessed the death of the celebrated Voltaire, the most brilliant genius of his age, distinguished alike as an elegant prose writer, poet, and philosopher; but, unfortunately for himself and the world, an atheist and champion of French infidelity. He prostituted his vast intellectual and moral powers, his extraordinary natural endowments and eminent scholarship, to the spread of atheism and the subversion of the cause and kingdom of Jesus Christ. His watch-word, written at the head of all his letters, was "*Ecrasez l'infame*," crush the wretch, meaning thereby our adorable Saviour. He is said to have died alternately supplicating and blaspheming the Son of God, the Redeemer of the world. Suffering inexpressible anguish of mind, he would cry out in plaintive accents, "O Christ! O Jesus Christ!" And then complain in the most pitiful and heart-rending strains, that he was "forsaken of God and man," presenting a most horrid and horrifying spectacle

to those who were present. In this last and most solemn scene on the stage of life, in this closing drama of his extraordinary career, at once so transcendently brilliant and so horribly gloomy, he found himself "having no hope and without God in the world," his sun going down in utter darkness and despair. So died the learned and distinguished Voltaire, the champion of French infidelity and practical atheism, the elegant poet, philosopher, and essayist. No one wishes to die as he died.

Let us now look at another picture, nearer home and more pleasant and cheering. In the year 1853, gently departed and "fell asleep in Jesus" a little child, infant son of the Rev. Dr. Schaff, after eight weeks of almost unparalleled suffering on the part of a child only about two and a half years old. With his own consent the painful operation of tracheotomy was performed, in order to extract a chestnut hull from his wind-pipe; and for three weeks the patient little sufferer breathed through the incision. During his protracted sufferings he would often, in childlike simplicity, say, "Heaven is a beautiful place; God is there, Christ is there, the angels are there, all good people are there." Near the close of his sufferings, in allusion to a child's hymn, which he had been taught, he said to his mother, "Ma, ma, I will fly up, up, up to heaven, like a 'little diamond in the sky.'" So died the little martyr, the gentle, submissive, patient sufferer, two and a half years old, who had been taught a few simple lessons in Christian piety. Who would not wish to die like that martyr lamb?

One scene more and we have done. Please, then, accompany me to a dark and dismal dungeon in the City of Rome, the mistress of the world. There on the damp, stony pavement, and chained to a rude and unfeeling soldier, sits an aged and venerable-looking man, small in stature, of dark complexion, with diminutive and deep-set eyes, stooped, sad, and care-worn, with an expression of deep and most earnest concern depicted on his countenance. We view him for a moment in silent awe and amazement, and then say, "Are you not Saul of Tarsus, the distinguished disciple of the learned and amiable Rabbi Gamaliel, at whose feet you sat, many a day an

admiring pupil?" He answers, "Once, sir, I was; but now am Paul, called to be an apostle, a disciple of the meek and lowly Saviour, Jesus of Nazareth." "Indeed, and did you not formerly denounce, in unmeasured terms, the religion of Christ, and persecute even unto death the disciples of Jesus?" "Once, sir, I did," calmly and ingenuously answers the aged and illustrious herald of the cross, "but I did it in ignorance; and now I preach the faith which once I destroyed, and deem it my highest honor and sweetest employ to be engaged in the service of my Divine Lord and Master, according to my earnest expectation and hope, that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but that with all boldness, as always, so now also, Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life or by death." "But did you not make a sad mistake in exchanging the established and popular religion of your illustrious ancestors for that of Jesus, the despised Nazarene?" "Not at all," is his ready reply; "I did, indeed, make heavy sacrifices in passing from the one to the other, but what things were gain to me, those I counted loss; yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith; that I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death, if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." "But will not your present deplorable situation and your prospective sufferings, in the cause which you have espoused, shake your confidence and despoil you of your present peace and of your future joyous anticipations?" "Nay, verily, in all these things we are more than conquerors, through Him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of

God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.” “But what, if you should fall a victim to the malice and fury of your implacable enemies, and your life be thus sacrificed to your excessive zeal and fidelity in the cause of Christ, will not this blast your fond hopes and disappoint, sadly disappoint, all your bright and glowing anticipations?” “Not at all. For we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.” “Are you, and your companions in tribulation, and in the Kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, then prepared to undergo all these immense sacrifices, to be subjected to untold privations, persecutions, sufferings, and death even, if need be, for the love you bear to Jesus Christ and His blood-bought Church?” “Yea, truly; we are indeed troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed; always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body. For we which live are always delivered unto death, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh. And so the Holy Ghost witnesseth, in every city, saying, that bonds and afflictions abide me; but none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the Grace of God.” Thus speaks Paul, the apostle. Such a hero infidelity has *never* produced, and what is far better still, such a hero infidelity never *can* produce.

When, for instance, has an infidel philosopher shown the noble and ingenuous spirit and heroic courage of Paul in the matter of humbly confessing his past errors, and cheerfully embracing the truth? A thousand times over have the corrupt principles of infidelity been confuted, and their legitimate tendency shown to be degrading and ruinous to men, and dishonoring to God; but in spite of all this, the advocates of these pernicious principles have remained unmoved. Verily such “men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil,” and consequently they continue in their wickedness.

Again, when has an infidel or atheist, a free-thinker of the modern school, devoted himself, in the use of his moral and intellectual powers to the good of his fellow-men, and generously offered up, as Paul did, his life for the public welfare? Such an instance is not to be found in the whole range of infidel activity and skeptical philosophy. Such entire, disinterested, loving self devotion to the public welfare, is a virtue which adorns none but the Christian character, a jewel that sparkles only in the martyr's crown. Determined and persistent attempts at revolutionizing human society and elevating man in the scale of being were indeed once made by the French illuminati; but, alas, instead of benefiting mankind, their efforts brought in their bloody train only desolation and ruin—utter ruin. During that fearful period of bloodshed and violence, very properly called the reign of terror, society became perfectly disjointed, law and order subverted, the sacred soil of France drenched in blood; all sense of security, both private and public, was lost, every sentiment of humanity and religion banished from the breast, human nature degraded, and God dishonored and insulted, and the whole country, as some one says, “resembled one vast slaughter-house, slippery with blood and pollution.”

And, finally, what infidel has ever deliberately faced danger and persecution in the defense of his cause, and sealed his testimony to the truth with his blood, as did St. Paul and a host of others, men who joyfully died for the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus? In the early ages of the Church such heroism and fidelity to the cause of truth were quite common. “The blood of martyrs flowed in torrents. The heroism of confessors braved every danger. Bishops ruled at the peril of their lives.” Men eminent in wisdom, piety, and station, joyfully gave up their lives for the wreath of immortality. “All the Bishops of Rome, for three hundred years, with only two or three exceptions, suffered martyrdom, and received the martyr's crown.” Has infidelity such witnesses for the truth?

Ah! no! It has neither confessors, saints, nor heroes, who, while serving their Divine Lord, gloried in chains and dun-

geons; no blessed martyrs to wear the immortal diadem. They who habitually glory in their unbelief, and boast of their superior intelligence, despising the humble believer in Christ, do not even *pretend* to have any such moral heroes, such glorious champions of the truth, to grace their infamous retinue, or to impart dignity, eclat, and lustre to their faltering cause. Ashamed of their pernicious principles, they must yield without a struggle this honor to Jesus Christ and His holy religion. "For their rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being judges."

ART. II.—THE CRISIS IN THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE
CRESCENT AND THE CROSS.

BY THE REV. JOHN I. SWANDER, A. M., LATROBE, PA.

THE eighth century of the Christian era was born before the midnight of the mediæval age. The power of the Papacy had just started toward the throne of its despotism, while Paganism was tottering upon the verge of its decline. The figures upon the dial-plate of history seemed to indicate that the world had gone back to gather strength for progress. The Star of Empire no longer mapped its orbit in the land of Shem. Africa had become entangled in the meshes of a moral night whose abiding darkness has required no less than a Livingstone of the nineteenth century to penetrate its interior. America was unknown, to the masters of navigation. Europe was the path of the world's progress and the field of its conflicts. Here the antagonistic legions of light and darkness entered the arena of mortal contest and struggled for the mastery over the elements involved. The skirmishes of other continents were of secondary importance in the performance of the world's great drama. The scope of the past had reached its meaning in the mystery of the cross. The Nazarene had solved the enigma of four thousand years. Judaism had fulfilled its peculiar mission

The sceptre had passed from the lion-tribe of Judah to the Lion of Judah's tribe. The uncircumcised civilization of Greece and Rome had been baptized in the Jordan of Christianity. The day of Pentecost had fully come, and, as a consequence, the Church had been born. The Herod of disappointed prejudice sought the young child's life to destroy it. Then heathenism breathed out threatening and slaughter. The bloody baptism of persecution had been administered to the infant bride, in the witnessing of the "noble army of martyrs." The first grand assaults of the gates of hell had not prevailed. The bush was not burned. The queen of heaven ascended the throne of worldly empire. The crown of Cæsar was foreign to the fair brow of her celestial majesty, yet she swayed the sceptre of Cæsar in the duty of self-defence and mission of self-development.

The wheels of Zion's chariot moved on. The faith once delivered to the saints had been crystalized into the Holy Catholic creed. Heresy had been repeatedly anathematized. The apocryphal writings of the New Testament had been detected, and the chaff winnowed from the wheat of inspiration. Northern vandalism had failed to raze the foundations of the New Jerusalem, which had come down from God out of heaven. The Church had grown to the period of her youth; her higher education was, therefore, in order. The lullaby of her nursery songs had served their purpose. She was called to put away childish things, but not to part with her childlike nature. The time was at hand for her to advance toward the upper circles of the Christian curriculum. Her discipline involved a passive suffering to endure, and a positive work to be done. The collection and preservation of all that was valuable in the museums of mythology, the composition of Christian literature, the constant correction of evil tendencies, the academic drill-march through the speculative subtilties of scholasticism were a few of the essential studies in her comprehensive "cursus" to the goal of graduation. This course she was called to pursue under the rod of correction. The great Principal sometimes placed this rod in the haughty hand of cruel pedagogues. Among these Mahometanism was not the most gentle.

That Mahometanism was raised up and tolerated of God for the purpose of applying the rod of correction and administering the moral tonic of discipline to the feeble and fallible elements of a finally infallible Church is an assertion not at all problematic in the light of Scripture and theological science. "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth" is a Scriptural declaration as true of the Church in her organic wholeness and historical completeness as it is of any individual member thereof, in any given time of her development. This truth was demonstrated already in the typical era of God's kingdom in the world. The famine in Canaan; the bondage in Egypt; the afflictive meanderings of the wilderness; the conflict with the Canaanites; the contaminations of surrounding idolatry; the frequent invasions of Philistia's haughty cohorts; the yoke of Syrian oppression; the captivity in Babylon; and the cessation of prophecy in the "dark ages" of Judaism were thorns in the flesh for the destruction of the flesh that the spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. The day of the Lord Jesus dawned, but the night of Zion's affliction had not ended. The school of discipline was more thoroughly organized. The Church came up out of the wilderness of Judaism to enter the furnace, whose heat had seven degrees of intensity. From the day of Pentecost unto the auspicious morning of the Reformation, the royal road of Zion was a thorny path, with less peace than pleasantness. Neither did the millennium dawn in the sixteenth century. There was more tribulation than tranquility in that great self-emancipating movement of the Holy Catholic Church. The Romish side of the Catholic Church gives continued evidence of distress by its preposterous assumptions and infallible contradictions. When one popish bull enters the arena for the very purpose of taking another by the horns, the combat becomes not only sufficiently exciting to entertain a crowded amphitheatre, but also of such a nature as to render doubtful "the immaculate conception" of either combatant. But has the Protestant form of Christianity no fears to quell nor foes to face? Is it not subject to the same law of chastisement in some other form? Yes. Adverse winds have blown

upon her *from* every point of the compass, while perverse internal tendencies have threatened to drift her from the safety of her legitimate moorings *toward* every point beyond the compass. And the end is not yet. Protestantism has not yet entered the Senior class. It is rather a Freshman with Sophomoric aspirations. "In the last days perilous times shall come."

These afflictive agencies and rods of correction are usually unconscious of their mission in the hands of Providence. Pharaoh knew not that he was raised up for the very purpose of illustrating God's power in the discipline and deliverance of His peculiar people. Nebuchadnezzar sought nothing but the ventilation of his vaunting vanity in the bitter bondage of the Hebrews. The scornful Babylonians knew not that the effect of their torturing tantalism was to increase the indispensable home-sickness of the weeping exiles when they required them to sing the Lord's song in a strange land. Thus carried forward by the unhallowed impulse of sordid selfishness, in the accomplishment of their own subordinate purposes, they generally ran into that excess of riot and cruel persecution, which rendered it necessary for the salvation of the elect, that either their days should be shortened, or their influence circumscribed by the hook of Jehovah's restraining power. 2 Kings 19: 28. The Saracenic power, whatever may have been the principal prompting of its founder, seemed, at least by times, to struggle for the complete conquest of this world and an immortality of sensualism in the world to come. With the irresistible impulse of contagion, and the abomination of desolation, it had swept the most civilized portions of two continents and commenced the circumvallation of Southern Europe, when Providence, at the battle of Tours, declared: "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed."

The records of that event are not as complete and satisfactory as might be desired. For much of what we have, we are indebted to Arabian chroniclers. From all sources we have enough to assure us that Anno Domini 732 was an epoch in history. Precisely one hundred years had elapsed since the

death of Mahomet; precisely seven hundred since the death of the Great Messiah. How weak the comparison, how great the contrast between these two distinguished persons! The one was distinguished by all that is dark, doubtful and delusive in the annals of a false faith; the other by all that belongs essentially to the glorious revelation of life and immortality. Yet the first century of the Hegira had more pilgrims to Mecca than the seventh century Anno Domini had to the Holy Sepulchre of the world's Redeemer. How great the enthusiasm in the propagation of a fraud! How languid the fires of zeal in behalf of all that was worthy of being remembered in the past, embraced in the present, and hoped for in the future.

But Christianity was not asleep. Mahometanism, while it outwardly enjoined many sound precepts, was inwardly carnal, and, therefore, had the flesh for its strongest ally. Upon the other hand, Christianity involved a crucifixion of the flesh. Its mission was to cast out this Ishmael of Arabia with all the bond-woman's children (Gal. 4: 29, 30), whether marshalled under the Crescent or numbered with the embannered hosts of the conquering Cross. Under this view, we risk nothing by the assertion that Mahometanism had more religion than the Church. Its religion was of the world, and therefore the world loved and propagated its own. The Caliphs had more wisdom than the Christian Fathers. Their "sensual" and "devilish" sagacity from beneath was, however, in wide contrast with the "pure" and "peaceable" doveliness from above. Rapacity sharpened the scimeter of its warriors, and the clamorous rage of unbridled passion deafened its ears to the most plaintive pleadings of the vanquished. In its practical operations it manifested but little disposition to distinguish between Pagans, Jews, and Christians. While it claimed to be Catholic, it was indiscriminately cruel. Ishmael's hand was against every man. (Gen. 16: 12). Pagan idolatry, Greek mythology, Jewish ceremonies and Christian faith, alike, were labeled "infidelity." The pill was sugar-coated, but its contents were no less poisonous. The cause was made to appear plausible, but there was death in the pot. The system contained truth enough to de-

ceive the nations (Rev. 20: 8), and falsehood enough to damn them for more than a thousand years. Its theory rejected everything but the mummery of the Alcoran, and embraced everything but the marrow of the Bible. It was born of the flesh, and of the flesh it inherited the capacity to comprehend all that fell within the compass of carnality. Into the dark bosom of this dreadful brotherhood the exploded paganism of the Orient could enter without any material change in the essential elements of its character. The paganism of the West had more constitutional vigor and independence, but was equally hostile in spirit to the principles of Christian civilization.

In this juxtaposition of the world's moral antipodes war was inevitable. Michael durst not bring a railing accusation against the devil when disputing about the body of Moses (Jude 9), neither durst Christianity play the pitiful poltroon when contending for the body of Christ. While Christianity attaches no special merit to the cultivation of military virtues, it recognizes the duty of self-defence, although the life and language of its author forbade the propagation of its principles at the point of the bayonet. Not so with Medina's monomaniac. As soon as he had room to marshal an army and followers enough to organize a battalion, he sounded the tocsin of war, and summoned the world to submit. The terms of surrender were dictated with the hilt of the sword, and their acceptance enforced with its point.

In the 115th year of the Hegira Providence placed this sword in the hands of Abderhaman. This veteran soldier and renowned commander of the Moslem cohorts, according to Arabian sketches of his character, was possessed of that personal probity which constituted him worthy of a better cause. Though not the cotemporary, his chapter in history was, in some respects at least, the complement of Attila's, who by his Hunnish hordes three hundred years before, sought to found the fabric of a pagan dynasty in the attempted destruction of Rome's Imperial powers, and the consequent subordination of that incorporated Christian element, in virtue of which the queenly mistress of the seven hills escaped the throes of sudden dissolution to pass

down the current of gradual decline. His army was not as large numerically as the almost fabled hosts that followed the standard of the "Vandal King" to the bloody contest of Chalons, but superior in the possession of that fanatical fury which fans the fires of all religious intolerance, and sharpens the sword of all pietistic and political propagandism. With this bigoted fervor and fancy of a false faith they moved forward in their sanguinary sweep, sanguine of success.

Elate and proud of that o'erwhelming strength
Which, surely they believed, as it had rolled
Thus far unchecked, would roll victorious on
Till, like the Orient, the subjected West
Should bow in reverence at Mahomed's name;
And pilgrims from remotest Arctic shores
Tread with religious feet the burning sands
Of Araby and Mecca's stony soil.

—SOUTHEY.

Thus the darkest delusion that ever duped the credulity of the world, or draped its children in mourning, seemed to march in the most unprecedented career of conquest. The prestige of victories already achieved, the prowess of their invincible arms, and the prospect of a sensual Paradise in the celestial embrace of ravishing beauty, made the battle-field a coveted amusement, and recklessness the better part of valor.

By such a fraternity of fraud, filled with such infatuation of fanaticism, commanded by the experience and skill of an idolized chieftain, the Saracenic standard was borne along the path of unparalleled desolation. Along this path what monuments of wantonness! What imprisonment of conscience! What a painful panorama of wretchedness and ruin! What acts of violence to the sanctity of person! What a devilish demolition of domestic endearments! What cruel conflagrations of homes and hamlets, while Pluto's pencil painted the horrors of hell upon the glaring canvass of the midnight sky. One half the Roman Empire had been torn away by its ruthless grasp. Persia was prostrate under Islam's heel. Syria had followed the fate of Jonah's gourd. Palestine had surrendered the graves

of Jehovah's true prophets, and the holy sepulchre of the prophet's true God to the feet of sacrilegious desecration. Egypt was scourged in a manner which in contrast gave a merciful appearance to the visitation of Pharaoh's frogs. The pestilential simoon of Arabia then wafted the invincible armada over the bosom of the Mediterranean. Spain bowed the suppliant knee, and furnished fuel for the fires of the conquering host that crossed the Pyrenees and came down into Gaul "like the wolf upon the fold."

Here let us pause and glance at the situation. Northwestern Europe was then only partially emancipated from the chronic thralldom of heathenism, and had therefore comparatively little strength to resist the well-organized powers of a false faith, whose fires of wild enthusiasm found combustible elements in every principality and province of an unregenerated world. True, the night was far spent, and the day was at hand, but the Sun of Christendom had not yet arisen sufficiently high to disperse the dense fog of its marshy lowlands. Christian civilization was just peeping through the twilight of approaching day. Society was yet rude and incoherent. There was no strong government west of the Rhine, and but little political permanence north of the Alps. There was uniformity in nothing; restlessness in everything. Imperialism had proven distasteful, and Feudalism was beginning to prove disastrous. The moral malaria of social disintegration floated in every breeze. The tree of Christianity had, indeed, been planted by the rivers of the North and West, but its sanitary leaves had not yet manifested their full power in the healing of the nations. From Britain to Burgundy and from Spain to Flanders, the country was "a chaos of uncombined and shifting elements." Dynasties transmitted the scepter with a trembling arm, and more frequently transferred it with the bloody hand of assassination. Princes were the puppets of a restless royalty, and the people more the subjects of contingencies than of crowns. Under these circumstances the army of Islam approached to thrust the gall of bitterness into the bitter cup of Gaul. Where was the rock of refuge against the rolling billows of fanatical

vandalism? What painful solicitude must have ruled the hour! No doubt the prayers of Christian faith, as well as the pleadings of pagan patriotism, ascended from many anxious hearts and quivering lips:—

“When wilt Thou save the people?
Oh, God of mercy! When?
From fraud and despots—tyrants!
By hearts and homes and men!
Shall crime breed crime forever?
Strength aiding still the strong?
No! say the mountains; No! the skies,
Our clouded sun shall yet arise,
And songs ascend instead of sighs.
God save the people!”

But where was the man for the times? The master-wheel of Providence performed another revolution, and the Lord's anointed passed under the consecrating horn.

Charles Martel was the chosen “Hammer” in the hands of Him who is “strong and mighty in battle.” This conquering hero of the age was Duke of the Austrasian Franks, the noblest representatives of Germanic Gaul. The historian's impartial pen makes favorable mention of his personal worth, as well as the experience, skill and prudence of his military career. These qualifications, illuminated by the brilliancy of his capital achievement, made him the worthy grandsire of Charlemagne, as well as that illustrious monarch's harbinger to the unsettled sovereignty of an ephemeral empire. To Charles all eyes were turned; in him the converging elements found a centre; and around him all the available forces were organized. His soldiers were not all Christians, yet they seemed to be men of hearts, and homes, and honor. In defence of all that was hallowed at home and dear in life, such an army could rally without any dangerous divergency of sentiment. There was a principle of union that made discord impossible, and a principle of honor that “turned the coward's heart to steel, the sluggard's blood to flame.” Many of the Mahometan soldiers cared more for the gratification of passion than for the

propagation of faith. The high-minded sons and virtuous daughters of Germany knew the meaning of a Moslem victory, and with fearful forebodings anticipated the wretchedness of the vanquished. Everything sweet in human existence, sacred in family relations, and hopeful in the budding promise of posterity, called them to strengthen the ramparts of their domestic citadels. The dawning rays of the Christian religion had added new charms to the native endearments of the hearthstone. Should these be surrendered without an attempt to defend their sanctity, and a determination to avenge their violation? Some nations seem fitted only for servitude and its consequent disgrace and degradation. Their necks seem to have been made and moulded to a special order for the yoke. Not so, however, with the Teutons. They have for many centuries demonstrated the almost axiomatic assertion that no people can be enslaved except those that are unfit to be free. Such was the blood that permeated the veins of the men who marshalled at Tours to defend Europe from the legions of Saracenic invasion. No doubt their fervent prayers to heaven were succeeded by a breath of bold defiance to their enemies:

“By the shades beneath us,
And by the gods above,
We dare your cruel hatred,
Despise your cruel love.
Our bride-groom's arms shall still enfold
An unpolluted bride,—
Our daughters' beauty still inspire
Their father's heart with pride;
Lest when our latest hope is fled
Ye taste of our despair,
And learn by proof, in some wild hour,
How much the wretched dare.”

Historians locate the battle-field upon the Loire, probably one hundred and fifty miles south of modern Paris. It was in the summer of 732. The exact date is unsettled. The event lives in history, not so much by the precise time of its occurrence as by the perpetuity of its influence. The army of invasion had already desolated Southern Gaul, one of the garden

spots of the continent, and was concentrating its lines around Tours. This boa constrictor from the torrid clime of fanaticism, having gorged itself upon the blood of millions, was about to encircle the inhabitants of another city within its fatal folds and fangs, and glut the cravings of its insatiable maw. The torch of wanton sacrilege was applied, both to the venerable shrines of heathenism and the newly consecrated altars of Christianity. Then came the turning-point in the conflict between the crescent and the cross. "King Calvus" flew to the rescue. Heaven championed the cause of humanity. The bugle of holy war converted cowardice into courage, and imparted strength to the weak. The great "cloud of witnesses" bent anxiously over the balusters of heaven. For seven days the respective armies charged and countercharged, while the swelling current of the Loire carried its crimson contents to the Atlantic. As the combat deepened success seemed to be settling upon the sanguine stars of "hate's polluted rag." The Christian army was driven to the vengeance of despair. Man's extremity was God's opportunity. Heaven embraced the opportunity and revealed a propitious arm. The enemy became impatient for the spoils, and hastened away to consume them upon their lusts. Their ranks were consequently broken. The Saracenic army was stricken with the paralysis of sudden demoralization. Abderhaman tried to bring order out of tumult. He fell in the attempt. The battle was decisive. Victory perched upon the banner of Christian civilization, and the star of hope arose above the horizon of Europe.

What would have been the course of all subsequent history and the present condition of the world, if Charles had lost the battle of Tours? What effect would a defeat have had upon the budding energies of the German race, which was then just arising to occupy a central position and exercise a controlling influence in every department of the world's progress, upon every continent of its territory, and through every age of its future? In the event of such defeat France might have become, what she has since been in fact, a prominent figure in the field of diplomacy and the dictatorial mistress in the world

of fashion, but her territory could not have been consecrated by a Christian Normandy, with a race of energetic men. No Normandy, and there could have been no proud Paladin of his age—William, the Conqueror,—even though Duke Robert had seen Arletta's pretty foot twinkling in the brook with fascinating charms. No William the Conqueror, and there could, or would have been no opening of Saxony's veins at Hastings, and no transfusion of chivalric Norman blood. No Norman conquest, and there would have been no epoch of English nationality in the regeneration of British jurisprudence at Runnymede. No Runnymede, and there would have been no Magna Charta for the mother country, and none of its immunities for her colonial children. What then?

Let us launch the bark of our inquiry upon the current, and navigate the waters of another hypothetical stream. Shall we say of that great crisis, "It may justly be reckoned among those few battles of which a contrary event would have essentially varied the drama of the world in all its subsequent scenes?" * In such different event, would the mosque's dark domes point to the heavens that are now penetrated by the Church steeples and cathedral spires in every corner of an expanding Christendom? Shall we say, in the sneering dialect of Gibbon's infidelity, that a different result would have interpreted the Koran in the classic halls of Oxford, and demonstrated the revelation of Mohamed in the pulpits of the British realm? If Western Europe had not spurned the Saracenic yoke a thousand years ago, would the Western world be free to-day? Would Spain have discovered this country? Would England have colonized it? Would France have liberated it? Would Germany have intellectualized it? Would Christianity have civilized it? Would the Church have Christianized it? Would God have done any or all of these things, through any or all of these agencies? If not, what then? And so on to the end of the chapter; but where *is* the end of the Chapter?

* Hallam's Middle Ages.

A desire to pursue such a line of speculative inquiry can certainly find a field sufficiently large for full gratification. Under one view, the event at Tours was no more important than any one of a million others with less prominence and no record upon the pages of written history. Besides, this path of inquiry would lead us to ask about the "what might have beens" of an alternative result in the events of the most acknowledged influence upon the destiny of the world. What if Herod had succeeded in destroying the "Young Child's life?" What if Satan had succeeded in the attempted destruction of the tempted Nazarene? What if the bitter cup had passed from the suffering Saviour in the gloomy garden? What if Judas had failed to carry out the programme of his perfidy? *Could he have failed?* If Christ was delivered into the hands of His enemies "according to the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," are not His enemies delivered and destroyed according to the same determinate counsel? Did the Heavenly Dove of victory overshadow the standard of Charles without the Father's corresponding approbation: "I am well pleased?" Did not Jehovah intentionally break the Saracenic bow asunder? Admitting the proper freedom of the human factor in this as in all organic links of history, we do not propose to be laughed out of countenance for asking the question: "How much room was there for a different result?" Was there room for the slightest possibility of an alternative? How far does the subjunctive mode find place in the grammar of the absolute Jehovah? Does the flower of the world's history run the gauntlet of a thousand contingencies to bloom in fortuitous fragrance? Will there be an occasion, at the end of the world, for a general congratulatory thanksgiving of the universe because the fecundous womb of history escaped the disaster of a universal abortion? Does the freedom of the finite factor involve the possibility of such an abortion? If not, does history not involve a necessity, an internal guarantee of continual progress toward an eternally predestinated point? Is this fatalism? Without such fatalism would there not be a possibility and consequent danger of fatal termination?

We step back that a greater may advance to the front of the stage. Hear him: "*History is God's way in the world.* It proceeds, not by chance. It is a process by which the purpose of the Divine mind is continually carried forward among men, towards its given end, to the full resolution of the end involved in it from the beginning." According to the above, there is no room for any contingency that could possibly turn the main stream of God's onflowing purpose from its eternally ordained channel, but room enough for the full freedom of all the factors, human and divine. Neither is there any room for supralapsarian fatalism, but room enough for supreme sovereignty. History, then, is not a catalogue of collected events in the order of their occurrence, but the continued revelation of God in the evolution of the world's constitutional forces. The devout and orthodox historian neither identifies God with the world, nor separates Him from it. He is adored in the majesty of His *distinct* existence and praised for the beneficent *presence* of His all-controlling and disposing power. Under this view, the development of the world's forces is recognized as the path of Providence. To be, for the historian, a path of peace and way of pleasantness, it must be seen, not from the metaphysical stand-point of a divine decree, but the Incarnation—the central observatory of the moral heavens. Here we have a cross that gems the middle, radiates the periphery, and maps the path of the world's true progress. This path is the orbit of the Holy Catholic Church. This is the central and normal current of the world's on-flow. All tributary agencies converge along this channel. There may be eddies and counter-currents along the banks, and even in the centre of the stream, but the gates of hell shall not prevail. The Mahometan movement was such an adverse power. It has been measurably overcome by the Providence of God through the dynamic forces of His own progressive kingdom, which ruleth over all. How our faith is comforted under this organic and panoramic view of Creation's problem with Christianity's solution! In this congenial atmosphere it can arise above the shadow of tormenting skepticism and leap over the moss-covered walls of

metaphysical subtleties. "The Son of God from the beginning to the end of the world, gathers, defends and preserves to Himself a Church, chosen to everlasting life, and I am, and for ever shall remain, a living member thereof."—Heid. Cat., p. 54.

A false idea of history is not the least heresy of this age. This, of course, is the counterpart of an unsound philosophy. We have "Histories of Philosophy"—piles of accumulated erudition; but where is our "Philosophy of History?" There is room in our libraries for just such a work—a call in our colleges for just such a teacher, and an emptiness in our popular faith for just such a comforter. The literary world has a chronic diarrhoea of chronological scribblers, and a corresponding costiveness of genuine science in the department of history. The true historian, instead of writing for the purpose of narrating events, uses events as figures upon the world's dial-plate, to indicate the direction of its current, illustrate the nature of its problem, and point out the progress of its solution.

The onflow of the world, in the strict and proper sense of history, cannot be realized and appreciated by that sort of philosophy which does not recognize the organic wholeness and finite headship of humanity. This, again, is equally impossible, without the corresponding recognition of Christianity in its proper historical character. But Christianity cannot be viewed in its concrete and essential character without a corresponding view of the Church in the sense of the creed, and the legitimate interpretation thereof. Church history is the arch of all history. The Incarnation is the key to the arch. Gibbon saw the fall of Rome; he had no faith to see the rise of Zion. Gibbon wrote from the stand-point of the world's infidelity; others from the stand-point of infidelity within the compass of the covenant. There may be a collection of fragmentary facts from the martyrdom of St. Stephen to the bloody night of St. Bartholomew; there may be an attempt to show the relation of cause to effect in the introduction of great events; there may be a partially successful analysis of certain tendencies in any given age; there may be a complete Encyclopædia of all theological tenets and ecclesiastical movements,

with a portraiture of all the prominent actors upon the stage, but there can be no legitimate Church history written from any other stand-point than that of a truly historical, Holy Catholic Church, which is the necessary, organic continuation of the new power brought into the organism of humanity in the Son of God's conception by the Holy Ghost and birth of the Virgin Mary, for the very purpose of stemming the current of the world's false movement and directing its ransomed energies upon the tidal waves of grace to glory.

Occupying this position, the view is commanding and cheerful. With such faith we have no occasion to apprehend a failure. God's purposes will ripen and the world's forces be developed in a line parallel with the progress of the Redeemer's Kingdom. Therefore, we will not fear, though the earth be removed and the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea by the combined agencies of the world, the flesh and the devil. The rage of the heathen, the despotism of the papacy, the anarchy of rationalism, the waning power of Mahometanism, the infidelity of the world and the gates of hell, shall spend their force in vain. The spiritual children of Isaac will soon inherit the ripest fruit of the promise, and the carnal posterity of Ishmael be rescued from the debris of an exploded hallucination.

ART. III.—THE NATURALNESS OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY REV. J. W. STEINMETZ, DANVILLE, PA.

SIGNIFICANT and humbling was the motto upon an ancient temple door—"Know thyself." For who can lay his hand upon his heart and say, I know myself? Nay, who can take the humblest flower and say, I understand this perfectly? Concerning many simple things, we cannot answer half the inquiries of the mind. To find mysteries we need not go to the supernatural order of the spirit world; for this world is full of them. All orders of life, and their subsistence upon inferior things, confront us as mysteries. The circulation of sap in plants, and of blood in animals has not yet been thoroughly mastered. And unenlightened by revelation, no man can know anything of the origin or reason of objects around us; can have anything but the merest notions concerning them; and even when these notions are systematically arranged they are unreliable, for notions are not science. Our knowledge is limited on all sides by the unknown.—We move in the midst of mysteries. Would we could do it reverently.

But why are all things so full of mysteries? If things are so full of mysteries in themselves, they are still more mysterious by reason of that which lies back of them, causing, conditioning, and upholding them. This causing, conditioning, preserving power, is the Will of God Himself, who is the Author of matter and spirit, nature and Grace. Thus matter and spirit cannot be antagonisms.—Hence it was so easy for Christ to work miracles in the very bosom of nature, yet with a power that was evidently above it. These miracles were natural in the sense that they were not unnatural nor anti-natural. True He cursed a fig-tree so that it withered; yet, how many trees does God yearly destroy by "stormy winds, fulfilling His Word?" Yet, surely, this is natural.

From this intimate relation between matter and spirit, nature and grace, Jesus drew also His many parables. He illustrated truths in the kingdom of God by the earthly avocations of life, and by facts of daily occurrence in nature around us—facts, which from their very commonness, and our familiarity with them, dull our perceptive capacities, so that we see not their marvelousness. Jesus did not say, a comparison *can be made* between the kingdom of heaven and a mustard seed; but, “The kingdom of heaven *is like* to a grain of mustard seed which a man sowed in his field. Jesus did not *make* the comparison, but simply *disclosed* it to our understanding; for the similarity lies in the very constitution of nature and grace, and in their relation to one another. Every sphere and branch of nature, owes its unvarying regularities to the previously existing, creative, organizing, and preserving power of God’s Spirit, Who brooded upon the face of the chaotic deep. In His own image, and after His own likeness, did God make man; which extends so far, that we can even recognize the impress of the Holy Trinity, as being adumbrated in the three-fold constitution of our personality—body, mind, and spirit. And Moses was expressly commanded to make the tabernacle after the pattern God had showed him in the mount. Nay, what is to hinder us from regarding the entire order of nature, as being formed after the prior order of the spirit world? Why may not the things on earth be copies of the things in heaven?” Milton makes an angel of his own creation to say:

“What if earth

Be but the shadow of heaven, and things therein

Hach to the other like, more than on earth is thought?”

. From Tholuck’s Book, *Gathered Flowers from Oriental Mysticism*s, we transcribe the following:

“The world of sense, is a shadow of the spirit world,
From which flows forth the nourishing milk for this
And feelings are captive monarchs
Concealed in the prison-cells of phrases.
When infinity enters the heart of the wise,
He must rise to its proper understanding,

Which must preserve for him the shadowy forms
Wherewith he can declare the infinite.
Yet perfect no image ever is—
Self-knowledge alone confers true benefits—
For would'st thou draw lessons from every image,
Thou must here much rescind—and there complete.”

St. Paul says, “The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead.” “The worlds were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.” Trench says, beautifully: “The denial of this truth is always possible; yet the lover of truth which shall be loftier than himself will not be moved from his faith, reflecting that however man may be the measure of all things here, yet God is the measure of man. That the same Lord who sits upon the throne of His glory in heaven, doth with the skirt of His train fill also His temple upon earth; that the characters of nature, which everywhere meet our eyes, are not a common but a sacred writing, even the hieroglyphics of God; and that the lover of this truth counts this his blessedness, that he finds himself in the midst of such, and so never without admonition or instruction.” “Thus, besides His revelation in words, God has another and an older, and one indeed without which it is inconceivable how the other could be made, for from this it appropriates all its signs of communication. This entire world with its kings and subjects, its parents and children, its sun and moon, its light and darkness, its sowing and reaping, its sleeping and waking, its births and deaths, is from beginning to end a mighty parable, a great teaching of grand supersensuous truth, a help to both our faith and understanding.” All nature, or creation, being such a parable, teaching and revealing that which caused and conditioned it, after the pattern or similitude of which it was fashioned, and which it foreshadowed; the coming of this substance itself in proper form and manner, must of necessity be natural also. This creation must have been formed with a view to the New Creation accomplished through Jesus

Christ our Lord—by whom, God also made the world at the first. Thus Christianity, the Religion named after Him, must be natural also. And the showing of this naturalness shall occupy us for the present.

The best way to define a term is to give its derivative sense. This is especially necessary as there has been so much disputing concerning the term "nature." So far as the word itself is concerned, it is derived from the Latin "natura," which means "a striving to become" or "be born." This would imply the idea of progression. That the thing or object called by this name, would not be complete at once, but that by a gradual unfolding or development it would attain its perfection.

In correspondence with this idea, the ancient Pantheists believed, that God, as the world-soul, had been gradually manifesting Himself in His struggles to attain self-consciousness. The first result of which effort was regularity in the mineral kingdom; the second, in simple life and growth as in the plant; the third, the power of sense and movement as in the animal; the last and highest, in self-consciousness, reason and will, as in man. And that in all the studies, meditations, labors, and longings of man, this world-soul or divinity was struggling to elevate itself and become independent of matter, which the ancient philosophers held to be essentially evil.

We accept the definition of the term nature, as "a striving to be born." We also believe in the progression of creation by periods, as the sciences demand and the Bible affirms. We believe also that God revealed Himself in the progressive stages of creation. But we neither believe that creation is an emanation from, nor an embodiment of God, but simply a manifestation of Himself; nor that it is the result of a struggle after self-consciousness, but rather a manifestation of His self-consciousness, for all is made according to a definite plan as we shall see. Neither do we believe that matter is coeval with God nor that it is essentially evil.

We believe that God created the matter of the universe, and gradually fashioned it according to His will; even as He is now modifying it according to this same will, which, on account of

its regularity and unchangeableness in all its relations, men without faith have termed it the Laws of Nature. We further believe that God added creatures more perfect in proportion as the end was reached. Nevertheless creation in its lowest form was nature, as well as before and after each successive manifestation of creative power.

In reference to this earth we are told "that the Spirit of God moved, or brooded upon the face of the deep," of course arranging the elements, separating the earth from the water—or solids from fluids.—Geology teaches us, that the rocks were formed by sedimentary deposition, according to the laws of mineralogy, similar particles of matter coalescing according to their elective affinity. So that the crust of the earth is composed of different materials systematically arranged around the entire globe. The earth as thus complete in itself, consisting only of the mineral kingdom, surrounded by gases and washed by waters, was nature. And astronomy brings strong presumptive proofs to light that go to show, that there are stars even now which are composed of inorganic matter alone. Such our earth must have been, before the creative fiat of Omnipotence successively clothed it with verdure—filled it with animals—and peopled it with man. These stars which are void of gases and fluids are not below nature, or unnatural. Neither was our earth before the creation of the organic existence upon it. The sun was its centre then as now—it performed its annual and diurnal revolutions as at present. The ocean heaved its tide under mysterious lunar influences. The atmosphere generated heat in chemical union and action with the solar rays causing currents of air or winds. The earth, barren of vegetation, its waters void of fish or reptiles, its atmosphere uncleaved by wing of bird, was all silent and dead. And yet this was nature—and all of nature then. This insensate though arranged matter could not possibly anticipate, or comprehend, anything higher. Neither could it unfold or develop into anything nobler. It was as such complete and perfect in itself.

Unbelievers have done their utmost to establish a development theory, viz., that all life developed out of matter. They

have failed to discover either in the fossiliferous rocks, or in present times a single monad or atom in the transition process from the mineral kingdom into the vegetable. Had particles of mineral matter by way of internal development advanced into the vegetable kingdom then would this latter have been a growth from the former, and as such a natural production. But this is philosophically impossible—the researches of Geologists decide emphatically against it, and thus confirm the teachings of the Bible that vegetation was a new creation. That it did not originate from inanimate nature either solid, fluid or gaseous—but was introduced into the mineral kingdom as a new principle, and by a power higher and foreign to it. The implantation of seed, and its growth are both facts supernatural to the mineral kingdom. And yet the earth was created directly for the vegetable kingdom. And this kingdom which is to us so natural, is still supernatural to the mineral kingdom. In the vegetable kingdom life was introduced, and development commenced. Through it the bare earth is clothed, beautified, adorned. And here again these two kingdoms, (the vegetable living in the bosom of the mineral subsisting upon, and ennobling it) these, were all of nature. Anything higher they could of themselves not anticipate or comprehend; neither could they develop into it. The mineral always remains a mineral—the plant always remains a plant,—it develops but only its own proper characteristics. Each order is fixed in its own sphere. And because the subjects of each kind, mineral, vegetable and animal existence, are thus bound by absolute and inflexible laws, the name kingdom has been assigned to these different orders in nature. Each has a nature separate and distinct and inconvertible. So that all beyond these two kingdoms was supernatural to them. Anything which they could not produce, lay beyond their province and order of existence. And as the plant cannot develop itself into an animal, the latter is supernatural to the former, and proves that what the Bible teaches is strictly true, that the animal kingdom was a new creation. The same is true of the human kingdom. The difference between it and the animal kingdom is even greater than that which exists between the vegeta-

ble and the mineral, or between the animal and vegetable kingdom. Each higher kingdom is supernatural to every lower, has come to it from above and from without, and not grown up from below, or from within. True they all occupy the same place locally, but characteristically they occupy different stages in the scale of being.

The addition of each higher kingdom lifted up all those orders of existence lower than itself. This shows progression, advancement. And yet it must be evident to every reflective mind that has not set out in its thinking with the purpose to dispense with the Creator in the formation of the universe, that these higher orders of beings are not productions of the lower. Their natures are so vastly different, the higher being strictly supernatural to the lower, so as to demand absolutely the exercise of new creative wisdom, life, energy and power to call them into existence.

Man though he lives upon the earth and subsists upon its products, yet spiritually he moves in quite a different sphere from the animal, which has even no mind. He stands upon a higher level, and is so evidently supernatural to it. Here then we have the mineral kingdom, the vegetable kingdom supernatural to it, and the animal kingdom supernatural to both, and last the human kingdom supernatural to all these. Each natural in itself, and yet each higher is supernatural to all the lower—unanticipated by them before its creation, and remaining for ever incomprehensible to them as they lack the capacities necessary to understand them. The lower can only receive the higher into their bosoms, from which the latter draw their subsistence; as did David's greater Son, His from the breast of His Virgin Mother.

Did intelligences even higher than man, inhabit a planet abounding in vegetable life, but destitute of animal life—the creation of the latter would be strictly a supernatural act for them—though animals considered in themselves would be far inferior to the intelligences inhabiting that planet. Left to themselves these intelligences higher than man, could never supply the deficit of the animal kingdom—so that there could be no other way than that of a new creation.

Nature so far as we are acquainted with it, is thus no development of an atom or monad as some would have us believe.*

Nature instead of being the development of a monad or atom is much rather as creation in successive stages, the unfolding of the Divine idea or plan actualizing and externalizing itself. God did not only create new forms, but rather new life and powers that took upon themselves new forms. The entire creation below man is bound to be just what it is—it can become nothing more, nothing less. It possesses no mind, hence it cannot learn—not advance or rise—no consciousness, no freedom, hence it cannot transgress or fall, and is not accountable for its actions. As such its individuals are only things. Man on the other hand is not a thing but a person, and hence a power. God made him free, endowed him with power to choose between good and evil. He originates and causes, and acts thus in a way supernatural upon that which is beneath him. Man, with his spirit being related to a higher world, and with his body being related to all terrestrial natures fell in abusing his freedom by choosing the wrong, dragged all nature with him, producing disharmony in the bosom of nature, and entailed, upon all things, ruin.

All woes which each man experiences, his longings and restlessness, and all the sad history of the race declare with the Bible that man is a fallen being. And now into this human kingdom fallen from his first estate Jesus Christ came, by the act of incarnation bringing redeeming life and grace and at the

* Oken says, "Organism is galvanism residing in a thoroughly homogeneous mass. A galvanic pile pounded into atoms must become alive again. In this way nature brings forth organic bodies."

How finely this idea is illustrated in Prof. Schleiden's Book, "The Plant, a Biography." He says, "One morning I entered the room of a madman whose constantly varying hallucinations especially interested me. I found him crouching down by the stove watching with close attention a saucepan, the contents of which he was carefully stirring. At the noise of my entrance he turned round, and with a look of the greatest importance whispered, 'Hush, don't disturb my little pigs, they will be ready soon. You see,' said he, with the mysterious air of an alchemist, 'here I have black pudding, pigs' bones and bristles in the saucepan, everything that is necessary, we want only the vital warmth and the young pigs will be ready made again.'"

same time establishing in the very bosom of humanity the kingdom of God, or of heaven. This life, this power and authority is foreign to the earth.

This new kingdom came into the world according to the order previously established in the bringing in of all the successive kingdoms of nature. This new kingdom grew not from nature up, but came in the person of Jesus Christ, the germ of the heavenly and the eternal life down from the spiritual world, taking upon Himself our nature, Himself the Godman, and thus established the Divine human kingdom of His Holy Church, of which He is the Head and Life.

And even the very mysteries that hang around this New Kingdom are in accordance strictly with the previous order of nature. There are many things in these lower orders that we cannot understand, while the higher is in no single instance comprehended by the lower. The lifeless mineral kingdom can never understand the vegetable that grows in its bosom and derives nearly all its nourishment from it. It can only receive it, and be by it in part absorbed and assimilated, so that portions of it are changed into living sap and wood, and thus animated and glorified. The same is the case with the vegetable kingdom in reference to the animal, and again with this latter in reference to the human kingdom. And thus also in strict accordance with the law previously laid down, the heavenly kingdom is a mystery to the human kingdom.

The vegetable kingdom is an insolvable mystery to the mineral kingdom, yet to man it is intelligible enough. So also may the Divine kingdom be perfectly perspicuous to higher orders of intelligences. And even we who now see in part may by growth in intelligence and spirituality, eventually understand the mysteries of this kingdom; for we shall know even as we are known. In worldly and spiritual matters, we who live now know much more than the ancients. And they still alive in the other world (and with whose old knowledge for stepping-stones, we have risen to our present attainments) know all now that we know, and most likely much more. And *we* learn gradually even now, for that of which we are ignorant

as children, we may discover as youths, but often understand only as old men, and occasionally not even then. And as there are some things reserved for our learning on the brink of the grave, so there are no doubt many things reserved for our heavenly study.

For knowing that man would fall, God planned the entire course of nature in such a way as to make redemption, or the establishment of His Kingdom in the world, possible. The whole system of nature is so constituted, as not to interfere but rather facilitate the extension of this first, though latest revealed kingdom. For earthquakes, tempests, freshets, famines, pestilence; in fact all disorders exhibit, enforce and express the curse of sin resting upon nature on account of the disobedience of man, its head and king. "The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God." "For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." Unconscious nature thus sympathizes with man in his fall and ruin, and is represented as groaning beneath the burden of the curse, and uttering its lay-prayer for the restoration of man, its prophet, priest and king, that it may itself be renewed and purified in and with him. For Satan in procuring man's fall by disobedience to God, established his own kingdom in and over the world. Jesus now, in working out man's redemption from the thralldom of Satan, re-establishes the kingdom of God on a deeper and surer basis than ever before. And thus is the mystery of man's fall, through the instigation of the devil, solved by the greater mystery of his redemption, through the seed of the woman as the conqueror of Satan and renewer of man. When we reflect that man was made in such a way as to be capable of redemption from his fall, and the entire course of nature renewable from the curse of sin, we can truly say, that all nature was made upon the idea of redemption. God's varied works are all formed, and introduced and carried forward upon the same plan; for the idea, and purpose, and work of redemption and glorification underlies them all, and so they shadow forth the Great Redemption by the God-man.

For the germinal life of the plant (a seed) comes to the soil in a mineral or earthly body, which must turn to common earth, that it may develop its life in a new and more extensive body. In doing this it absorbs with its roots the inanimate matter of the earth, takes it up into itself, energizing, changing, animating and converting it into living sap and wood. Thus is the mineral kingdom ennobled, lifted up into a higher sphere—redeemed to a certain extent from its low estate in which it was made. In itself, it is lifeless, but it lives in the plant, blooms in its flower, and ripens in the luscious fruit. Here certainly is a shadow of redemption. The barren earth becomes fruitful in the vegetable—the bare earth is clothed and adorned by the green grass sparkling with diamond dew, and perfumed with exhalations from myriads of blooming flowers, and so made a glorious bride, led blushing forth to her marriage with the animal creation. The animal kingdom takes up the mineral and vegetable kingdoms, and converts portions of them into living bone, or into sensate flesh, blood and nerves. In it nature attains or rises up to sensation and locomotion. Here is also a lifting or raising up of the lower by the higher. Man subsisting upon all beneath him assimilates it, and builds a body which is a part of his person, and so elevates all and glorifies, and crowns it in himself, its self-conscious king. He certainly redeems it in a sense, and was in his pristine state to “replenish and subdue,” and rule over it. Solid fluids, gases, minerals, vegetables and animals are in man, personally united with mind and spirit, and so certainly redeemed and glorified.

It seems to us that this regular order of progression, from the lower to the higher in nature, every higher being supernatural to the lower, so created in succeeding epochs, stretching in a regular chain interlinking from matter in the mineral—to the spiritual in man—that this order points beyond itself. And as the lowest kingdom consists of insensate matter alone, from which the scale of being rises gradually up to man; so there seems to be a demand for a purely spiritual kingdom. Beings of pure spirit seem to be needed to complete the chain. The Scriptures tell us that there are

such, the angels or messengers. These we cannot see, for they are spiritual, and our senses are physical. And these pure spirits may call themselves natural. To them the kingdom of God in its state of glory to which they belong, may be natural. And if they call themselves natural as is highly probable; then are creation and nature synonyms. Then would nature as creation embrace all, but God Himself—supernatural, Angels are to us, (even as we are to the animals) for their nature is a manifestation of Divine power superior to ours—but still for all this, they are in themselves natural. In this way we can see how various nature is. And how the terms nature and supernatural are variously applied. How nature becomes more extensive as it is viewed by higher intelligences. And how that which from one stand-point, must be pronounced supernatural, yet regarded from another is simply a higher form of the natural. Thus while we are supernatural to the three kingdoms of nature below us, and the angels are supernatural to us—they regard themselves and us with all below us strictly natural. But though this view of the case enlarges the scope of the natural—it does not diminish that of the supernatural, for that which is truly supernatural is infinite, and the infinite can neither be increased nor decreased.

The same idea also holds true when we consider nature in relation to grace. In a sense all creation is a gracious work. God for His own sake and pleasure created all things. He created gratuitously not that He needed it—while of merit, we cannot speak concerning the uncreated—because that which is not, cannot merit anything. So He created, preserved, and redeemed in Grace. Nature is thus a result of grace. But as fallen it is the object of grace to restore it. And in this sense nature and grace are and never can be synonyms, but must remain co-relatives, as matter and spirit. Nature is fallen and can never restore itself. To do this is the work of Grace. Thus is the new creation in Christ Jesus a work of grace of a higher order than was the old creation.

Before the fall, the chain extending from the lowest order

of creation to the highest was perfect. The kingdoms of nature touched each other, and through man the appointed king all earth held communion with God, and all the kingdoms of nature worshiped in sweetest harmony, "for the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." But man willfully separated himself from all good spiritual power above him, and so created a fearful chasm between himself and God, and disharmony between all the powers of nature below him.

To restore this more than repairing was needed—the case was beyond mending. Such a course would moreover be derogatory to God Himself, and would be contrary to the order of nature as presented above. The case was also beyond teaching—for the fall was not so much intellectual as moral. Nor would a change of place avail, not even a taking into heaven, for it was not a local Fall, but one that was spiritual. The gulf was not one in space but in character, that separated man from God.

Neither would the creation of a new race answer, for if free they might also fall, and if they would not fall, this would not redeem or restore the first and lost. Neither would a union of man and angels answer, for some of the angels had fallen, and man's spirit was already angelic in its nature. Moreover angels are only creatures, "and could as such not bear the burdens of God's eternal wrath against the sins of all mankind," nor make an atonement for sin so as to deliver the race; for it would have no infinite value, but at the utmost one that would be simply personal. Neither would God's justice allow the punishment for man's sins to fall upon innocent angels, (for guilty ones could not atone for others) and angels being finite and sin an insult against the infinite, they could at best only redeem man by enduring eternal perdition themselves. This would however not be redemption, for it would only be substituting one order of beings for another, to be destroyed forever.

Neither would the manifestation of God alone answer except for condemnation. This was done at Mt. Sinai in the promul-

gation of the Holy Law of God, simply, however, as preparatory to redemption. The only course left was the New Creation as accomplished in the person of the God-man, Jesus Christ. In Him Divinity and humanity previously sundered by the act of sin are for ever joined together in personal union. In this way is fallen humanity lifted up into the closest relation with the Deity. And this fact of the incarnation did not terminate with the death of Jesus Christ upon the cross, but if anything, rather was perpetuated and extended in it, and the resurrection from the dead, for He arose, as God-man establishing upon earth the Kingdom of Heaven in His Divine-human Church, which is His body.

He came in a truly historical way into the world, even by birth, thus in the very bosom of humanity, coming into living, actual, personal contact with the deepest fountain of human life, sanctifying, cleansing and regenerating it, not starting an absolutely new race, but reheading the old race, becoming the Second Adam greater than the first, being made the quickening spirit. He came thus into the very bosom of humanity as Divine as His Father, God, and as human as His mother, Mary. In His person redemption, regeneration, salvation and sanctification of the race are all objectively complete. And all these are carried forward in the Divine-human organism of His Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. His Church is not human, neither is it divine, but divine-human. He did not hover over humanity in pure supernaturalism, but came taking up as the supernatural Life His abode in humanity, joining Himself really and truly with its life and progress in the sphere of nature.

And in His Church by spiritual and divine powers humanly used and applied, by the Word and Sacraments, under the benign influences of the Holy Ghost, He is mysteriously assimilating sinners to Himself. He makes, sinners dead in trespasses and sin, living saints, the slaves of Satan freemen of the Lord, true children of God. He thus quickens every member of the race who yields himself entirely into His power under the wooing influences of His grace. He, so to speak, takes

them up into Himself and gives them His own divine-human and holy life and so quickens and cleanses them. Just as the tree rooted and grounded in the earth will by its roots absorb mineral matter and moisture, and assimilate them to itself, imparting to them its own nature and life, redeeming them. Thus the vegetable kingdom in its long sway takes up nearly the whole earth into union with itself. It can even be said to be vegetable life and powers with mineral matter organically united. So the Church is the highest organism, being the union of divine grace, power and life with human nature in its weak, sinful and dying condition, regenerating and sanctifying it, nay even glorifying it in the resurrection at the last day.

And so Christianity, the Divine Kingdom, is propagating itself, not in a human way only, nor in a purely divine way. Vegetation does not propagate itself over the earth, nor under the earth. It does not become earthly, neither does the earth become vegetable. But the vegetable kingdom lives and grows in the ground, in the soil, and thus lifts it up. So Christianity propagates itself in the very bosom of humanity in a truly natural way of its own. It does not raise humanity up into divinity, or merge divinity into humanity, nor mix it, but unite them organically, so that every child of God can say, (retaining his individuality and personality,) "I live yet not I, but Jesus Christ liveth in me." "We in Him" in the organism of His Church, and "He in us" pervading and sanctifying us by His blessed and holy life.

Thus we see how Christianity, the religion of the God-man is natural. In its advent it agrees fully with the order established by nature, coming into nature from above, from outside.

In its working it is redemption. We have seen how each higher kingdom took up into itself the lower; ennobling, exalting and glorifying it, nay, and perfecting it, thus in a sense redeeming it by assimilation, and imparting—to particles thereof (at least) its own nature. Christianity does this in a higher order and to a more perfect degree.

We have seen how each higher kingdom is supernatural to the lower, and hence also an insolvable mystery to it. So

that Christianity, the religion from God, still agrees with this course of nature, in being supernatural and incomprehensible to man.

And so also is it natural in moving forward in the very bosom of that kingdom through which it came into the world, establishing as a new creative principle and life of sanctifying power a new kingdom that is foreign to the world, and which will, in the course of time, become as universal upon earth as any other : and being the highest and first of all, will rightly be eventually supreme.

So also is it natural in its growing so gradually and in a way peculiarly its own, differing from all other kingdoms, both those below man and human kingdoms established upon earth, such as governments. And naturally enough like all kingdoms it has a King great, good and glorious.

Christianity corresponds also with the general course of nature in having gradually dropped its extraordinarily miraculous exhibitions, after its proper establishment in the world. In itself it is still the standing miracle challenging our faith, the grand supersensuous mystery supernatural to man in his fallen state, yet working wonderfully in this very fallen nature ; the proper continuation of the great mystery of the Incarnation from which the Church develops as the oak does from the acorn. In this sense or view the Church can never become natural as sinking into nature. But as God does not create immediately, but has laid the power of propagation into each kingdom of nature, so also does God not now immediately and in any externally miraculous way call men to Himself or regenerate them. These powers He has lodged in the organization of His Divine-human Church. As Christ's mystical body she possesses inhering life powers to propagate herself, like every natural kingdom, in a way peculiar to herself. Jesus Christ is not carnally born in every believer as He was at the first of His virgin mother. Every Christian is now spiritually born in the Church, the mother of us all, in whose mystical womb we became partakers of the Divine-human Saviour, who, as He assimilates us to His body, He imparts to us His own

life. The Holy Ghost is not poured out miraculously as at the first. But abiding in the Church, He pervades every member in true communion with her as the body of Christ.

Internally, in the organization of the Church, God works as miraculously and supernaturally as ever. But it is a matter of fact that externally no such miracles are wrought by the servants of the Church, as Christ and the Apostles wrought in the beginning, curing the sick and raising the dead. And in having dropped these external miraculous exhibitions, Christianity has conformed to the general order of nature as heretofore pointed out. The continuation differs necessarily from the beginning.

In conclusion. All nature being formed with the idea, purpose and actual work of redemption underlying it, each higher, ennobling and glorifying nature, not as fallen, but as made low, leads us to conclude, that the incarnation did not depend upon the fall of man. Much rather does the whole order of nature show that He would have become incarnate, so as to properly head, ennoble and glorify humanity. We cannot conceive that all nature from the lowest to the highest order should have been constructed upon such a redemptive plan as it was, when the incarnation and consequent glorification of man could only be such an after-thought of God, depending upon a false step or act of the creature. These types and shadows of redemption in the lower kingdoms of nature would certainly have been fulfilled had man not fallen.

But however adopted or planned, the incarnation is great and glorious, being full of goodness, mercy, love and truth. Oh, that all might yield to its holy, gentle influence, as exerted by the Church. Lord hasten the day when the Messiah, Prince of Life, and King of Glory, all knees bending, all hearts paying homage before Him, all tongues confessing and praising Him as the Lord God blessed for evermore, shall walk among the nations; that His Church then embracing the world sanctified, may, under His benign rule, keep glorious jubilee and worship Him world without end.

ART. IV.—THE MISSION OF PHILOSOPHY.

BY ALEXANDER HARRIS, LANCASTER, PA.

RELIGION being a part of man's nature, the untutored savage is wont to feel and recognize God in the surrounding compass of nature. He experiences in his own inner being a feeling of dependence upon some superior essence; and at once he begins to inquire what this is, and where located. The sun and the stars being inaccessible to him, he attaches superior importance to these, and afterwards pays them the homage of his adoration. Myriads of other objects come in for recognition, as the habitations of the superior power which the uneducated man feels has an existence, but of which he has nought save conscious knowledge. The multitude of deities worshiped by the early Greeks in the days of Hesiod, we learn, from the writings of the poet himself, to have numbered thirty thousand; and so multitudinous were the objects of worship at a later period in the eternal city, that one was induced sarcastically to remark that in Rome the gods even surpassed the men in numbers.

The condition of man, at the period of which we speak, was of the most degrading character; superstition as an incubus weighed upon all his mental aspirations, and the gloomiest forebodings were part and parcel of his daily being. The philosophic lumination of ages that came to the rescue and broke the manacles of mythic imposture can in no sense be characterized but as an illumination of divine resplendence sent from the throne of the eternal, ever-existing mind, which has created and governs for the best all individual existence. The first grand achievement of philosophy, therefore, was *its education of the ancient intellect up to an approximate knowledge of the true God, and its preparation for the reception of the true faith.*

The method of the ancient philosophers, in dividing their instruction into an esoteric and an exoteric kind, was required in

order to meet the adaptabilities of mankind. In the infancy of the race nothing save the mythologic creeds of an early superstition, in which were portrayed the vengeance of the gods upon the iniquities of a Tantalus and an Ixion, would have served to repress the passions and injustice of men and nations. The philosophic mind could laugh at the follies of the popular faith, but dare not impart to the illiterate the truths of a higher comprehension, as they were incapable of receiving them. Homer himself, the earliest of the Greek poets, is believed to have seen the truths of a purer theology, although the whole scope of his matchless poems rests upon the fictitious conceptions of mythic fancy. So at least is the master poet of antiquity interpreted by St. Cyril of Alexandria. The feuds of the Olympian deities, the guiles and deceptions of the king of gods and men, and the boisterous rage of Juno were but portraiture of the untutored Grecian fancy; but within the chambers of his own breast the inimitable author of the *Iliad* worshiped the one uncreated God, who was the first of all beings. The Orphic fragments also give early attestation of the belief of the educated mind of Greece in the existence of one unmade deity, the original of all things. And although Orpheus names this self-existent deity Jupiter, it is by no means to be inferred that he attaches to him simply the ideas usually attributed to the mythologic god of this name, the son of Saturn; for he expressly names attributes due only to the uncreated ruler of the universe. At these early periods it is to be expected that the ideas of the most acute reasoners and philosophers would be very crude and unsettled. But the philosophic spirit of inquiry and reflection had already begun its work, and it remained for the following schools of Greek thought to make further advances.

From an apothegm of Thales, quoted by Diogenes Laertius, that "God is the oldest of all things," it may be inferred that the founder of the Ionic school of philosophy believed in one uncreated God. His contemporary, Pherecydes Syrus, seems to have entertained the same opinion. In the golden verses of the founder of the Italic school and in the fragments of Ocel-

lus Lucanus, it is clearly gathered that Pythagoras believed in one supreme deity, although also speaking of inferior. His principal god, however, contained the whole of the subordinate ones. Thus was the common notion of the illiterate Pagans as to a multiplicity of deities exploded in the estimation of these philosophers, and of those who followed them. Xenophanes, Heraclitus, Anaxagoras, Parmenides and Empedocles are all upon record as accepting, in one form or other, of the unity of the godhead. Antisthenes, the head of the Cynic sect, declared that "although different nations and cities had objects of worship of their own deification; yet for all that but one God existed."

Up to the period of Socrates, the Grecian mind seemed as it were groping in a night of almost Egyptian darkness; but with the advent of this sage clearer rays of philosophic light burst upon the horizon of the thinking world. Besides attaining to a more accurate conception of one God, the creator of the universe, Socrates was the first, as Cicero avers, who drew philosophy from heaven and domesticated it in the habitations of men. Of this light of his race, Tertullian writes as follows: "*Propterea damnatus est Socrates, quia Deos destruebat,*" i. e., that he suffered death from his preaching up a knowledge of one God. In his discourse with Aristodemus, quoted by Xenophon, Socrates convinced him that the things of the world were not the production of chance, but the work of intellect and design. He also endeavored to convince him that our mind and understanding was derived from a vastly superior and transcendent mind, existing somewhere in the universe; and although this was invisible, nevertheless it must in all reason be accepted. "Is not," argued he, with his doubting friend, "your own soul, which rules over your body invisible, and by parity of reasoning might you infer that you do nothing by mind and understanding, but all by chance, as well as to conclude that all things in the world are done without a ruler?" And notwithstanding the clear attestation of Socrates to a belief in one supreme and universal numen, it is still clear that he by no means rejected all the inferior gods of the Pagan system, as has been

by some conceived. That this is so, is apparent from his last dying mandate to his philosophic friend, Crito, after he had swallowed the fatal draught, that he should not fail to offer a votive cock for him to Æsculapius. The last words of the expiring philosopher may indicate this, however, that notwithstanding his reason had triumphed over the superstitions of his childhood and youth, *in articulo mortis*, they again overpowered him.

But it was in the ruminations of Plato that the Grecian mind attained to the clearest conception of one uncreated and self-existing deity, who was the creator of the whole universe, as also of the subordinate and inferior gods. That many of the latter existed, as he believed, his writings fully attest. No further illumination was made by the reasoning mind of Greece over that exhibited in the writings of Plato as to the unity of the godhead, and indeed most of the subsequent philosophic attempts served but to mystify what this divine thinker had presented. We do not, however, see in this philosopher the amplest presentation of the unity; but in him first is caught the clearest glimmer of a triune hypostasis of quasi personages in the Godhead which prepared the minds of the heathen philosophers of after ages for the reception of the trinity of revelation. That Plato accepted such a trinity, the following from Cudworth is cited—*Intellectual System*, vol. 2, pp. 300–301: “Though some have suspected that trinity, which is commonly called Platonic, to have been nothing but a mere figment and invention of some later Platonists, yet the contrary hereunto seems to be unquestionably evident that Plato himself really asserted such a trinity of universal and divine hypostases, which have the nature of principles. For, first, whereas, in his tenth book of *Laws* he professedly opposing Atheists, undertakes to prove the existence of a deity, he does notwithstanding there ascend no higher than to the *Psyche*, or universal mundane soul, as a self-moving principle, and the immediate or proper cause of all that motion which is in the world. And this is all the god that there he undertakes to prove. But in other places of his writings he frequently asserts above the self-moving *Psyche* an

immovable and standing Nous, or intellect, which was properly the Demiurgus, or architectonic framer of the whole world. And lastly, above this multiform intellect, he plainly asserts yet a higher hypostasis, one most simple and most absolutely perfect being which he calls τὸ εἶν, in opposition to that multiplicity, which speaks something of imperfection in it, and τ' ἀγαθόν, goodness itself, as being above mind and understanding, the first intelligible, and an infinite fecundity, together with overflowing benignity. And accordingly in his second epistle to Dionysius does he mention a trinity of divine hypostases all together."

But it was long afterwards in the pondering conceptions of Philo, a Jewish philosopher of Alexandria, who was profoundly versed in Academic lore, that the hypostatic trinity of Plato first came into manifest and clear personification. This necessarily supposes many intermediate stages of mental development between the head of the Academy of Athens and the philosophic cotemporary of the man of Galilee, all of which are now buried in the oblivious gloom of past ages. Philo in his thinking represents the developed consciousness of Pagan and Jewish philosophy, and portrays the intensified need of that revelation, which although to the philosopher unknown, had actually taken place. Greek philosophy had performed its part of preparation in the world's education. The fullness of time had come, and the Divine herald was proclaiming the truths of revelation. The educated world is in a condition to comprehend what otherwise would have been inexplicable. Herein then is, in one aspect, the mission of philosophy illustrated.

Another mission of philosophy was the establishment of correct moral maxims for the regulation of men and nations. As with Socrates clearer notions came to be entertained concerning the first cause of all existence; so with this philosopher likewise ethics began to be one of the subjects of men's meditations. From his time, therefore, moral philosophy was cultivated. This branch of human thought was not like the metaphysical speculations concerning the Deity confined to the followers of Plato; but even the other philosophical schools vied with each other,

and the most orthodox in the enunciations of maxims for the government of life. Besides the Academics, the followers of Epicurus and the Stoics were great advocates for correct principles of morals. This serves as evidence to confirm the belief that the maxims of morality are based upon the immutable principles of right and wrong existent in the nature of man and the whole economy of creation. Upon what other assumption can the ethical system of Stoicism be supposed to rest? In a system in which death was proclaimed as an eternal sleep it would seem as altogether unreasonable to expect a pure system of morality. And yet such do we find in this school of philosophy. Of this sect of philosophers Montesquieu speaks as follows: "Of all the sects of philosophers among the ancients, there was none whose principles were more worthy of man, or better fitted to make men good, than that of the Stoics."

The divine lesson implanted in the mind of man by his Creator was in all these cases an unconscious guide as it were in elevating and moralizing the human race and educating it so as to be fitted for the reception of that more perfect morality yet to come. The heathen moralists and others were right when they estimated philosophy for its great usefulness in instructing and directing mankind and healing the distempers of the mind. Plato, Tully, Seneca, and Plutarch all esteemed law as the product of right reason, and consequently the will of God. Cicero uses this language: "God, the Common Master and Lord of all, is the Inventor, the propounder and the Creator of law." Indeed the writings of Epictetus and Marcus Antoninus present a sublime ethical standard rivalling in the estimation of many pious and learned men the pure morality of revelation. The erudite Meric Casaubon, in his preface to his translation of Antoninus's *Meditations*, expresses himself thus: "I must needs say, that if we esteem that natural, which natural men of best account, by the mere strength of human reason, have taught, and taken upon them to maintain as just and reasonable, I know not any evangelical precept or duty, belonging to a Christian's practice (even the harshest, and those that seem to ordinary men the most contrary to flesh and

blood not excepted) but upon due search and examination will prove of that nature."

That a higher ideal of ethical purity was steadily building itself up in human consciousness seems evident; as a great difference is discernible between the moral standards of the earlier and later philosophic schools. Every reader of history is aware that the heathen systems of Neo-Platonism and Stoicism that for ages ran counter and along-side of Christianity exhibited in their teaching the most amiable principles and moral maxims that to the unlettered might appear as if filched from the Divine system then spreading itself throughout the length and breadth of the Roman Empire. Such for ages was the opinion of most writers, but this is now clearly disproved in the developments of modern criticism. The God-illuminated reason of man was therefore simply performing its part in the education of the world, and preparing for the conversion of the nations which entered the Church of the Redeemer in the early ages of its history.

The dissipation of the myths of antiquity was also accomplished by philosophy. The early races of the world having no other conceptions than those derived from objects of sense, deified these and paid them their adoration. Hence arose the infinite number of the ancient gods and goddesses. The contemplation of the surrounding universe could not but serve to suggest to the most illiterate the existence of some being superior to themselves. He must however be in their opinion some mighty corporeal creature who had his throne upon a lofty elevation to which none but powers like himself were admitted. Jupiter seated upon the pinnacle of Olympus was far from the earliest belief of the human mind concerning the ruler of the skies. This king of gods and men was himself born as human beings, and descended from an ancestry arising out of chaos. Ages of reflection no doubt preceded even this crude conception of deity; and many more were required to evolve the more pure Platonic ideas of the unmade and self-existing Creator of the universe. All this was the work of the philosophic mind. With the establishment of the various philosophical schools superstition and imposture were compelled to retire into the background; and

the classic age of Cicero and Horace saw the educated classes of Greece and Rome a unit in their disbelief of the early fables of their fathers. All these were in popular acceptance atheists, but veritably real theists, capable of understanding genuine truth and fitted for its reception when presented. As long as they had remained attached to the early fables, they would have been incapable of receiving a revelation of truth as the same was vouchsafed to be given.

The rounding and solidification of revelation into a true Christian edifice was another work of philosophy deserving of some attention. This task was devolved upon the Greek Christians of Alexandria, headed by Justin Martyr, Clement, and Origen. These intellectual giants were profoundly versed in the truths of Evangelical knowledge, and were also sailing in the most advanced currents of speculative philosophy. The manifold heresies that arose in the bosom of the early Church and distracted it were in a great measure influenced by the skeptical spirit of the age, which had been engendered in the old schools of Platonism, Stoicism, and Pyrrhonism. To combat these a knowledge of philosophy was required, and this alone was found in the Greek school of Christians, which sent forth the renowned leaders of the early Church that aided in the overthrow of the Pagan hosts and their enrollment as soldiers of Christ. The Latin Church from the first steadily set its face against the metaphysical systems of the Greek schools of thought, characterizing them all as the work of Satan, and hence Tertullian, the ablest and most renowned of these early leaders, eschewing the aid of philosophy was unable to endure the heretical assaults of Montanism, which for a period overspread with desolating ruin the faith of the ancient Church. But as dominant Rome accepted all her philosophy from subjugated Greece, so the imperious Latin fathers, though unconscious thereof, became subordinate workmen in the erection of the great edifice of the Christian Church. They also received the instruments of their workmanship from the Greek masters of Alexandria, who were alone competent to supervise and polish the magnificent temple as it arose. The arms by which Gnosti-

cism, Manichæism and other similar heresies were battled and overthrown came from the armory of the Alexandrian fathers; and none but these were competent to propound and establish to faith-acceptation the mysterious doctrine of the Trinity as the Nicene Council accepted it. The perfecting process of the Greek mind still aided in the establishment of the Church until the days of St. Augustine, who crowned the mighty edifice by the power of his far-reaching logic and deep penetration. The great structure thus completed by this Achilles of the Latin fathers was the Church, which bore omnipotent sway during the whole period of the middle ages, and which in one form may be said to remain unshattered up to the present epoch.

But it was with the borrowed implements of the Grecian metaphysics, that had been transmitted by Philo, Clement, and Origen, that Augustine was enabled to perfect the great work of his aspirations; and so soon as the undertaking was completed and these were laid aside, as Latin dictation demanded, a long night of darkness followed. The rulers of the new edifice, still cherishing the old conceptions of their ancestors that philosophy was allied to the black arts, caused the imperial mandate of a Justinian, who ordered all the philosophical schools of his dominions to be closed for ever. Reason retired to the silent haunts of obscurity and the gloom of mediæval superstition and ignorance, for long successive ages, covered the world of intellect; and which was made the more sensible by the flickering lights of a few thoughtful monks that shone from their solitary monasteries. It was the gloom of scholasticism. The Church calling itself Catholic now reigned supreme.

Philosophy again procreated the influences that germinated in the Protestant reform. From the period that the Church reigned omnipotent, but weak opposition was made to its authority until the revival of letters opened the flood-gates of free inquiry, never again to be closed. During all the period of the dark ages a slumbering opposition, as it were, existed towards the arbitrary authority of the Church upon the part of the human mind. Now and then a spirit of more than ordinary

intellectual vigor rising up and asserting the potency of reason and in turn calling down upon itself the ban of ecclesiastical authority, which for a time silenced the temerarious inquirer either by a recantation or in the flames of an *auto da fe*.

Philosophy, the product of human reason, when banished by Justinian from the Grecian schools was compelled to wander in exile for some centuries, until at last it was permitted to become the servant of its Christian master in the schools of Charlemagne and under the supervision of St. Alcuin. It could study antiquity, read the beautiful master-pieces of Greece and Rome, and philosophize within the race of authority; but death to the rash spirit that dared to transcend its bounds. Such was scholasticism; and such the vaunted philosophy of the schools of the middle ages. The inquirer might reason according to the dialectics of Aristotle so long as he did not thereby violate any of the decisions of the Church. Should an Anselm or a Thomas Aquinas go beyond the accustomed range of thought in his metaphysical ruminations, he could obtain canonization, because no other in his age was sufficiently acute to probe his researches. Fortunate philosopher he; for had some equally adroit dialectician come across his path, the war would have been terrific; and instead of the philosopher being honored as the *angel of the school*, and applauded by all his auditors, he might have been compelled to succumb beneath the shades of a monastery and under the frown of ecclesiastical displeasure. The dexterous opponent of William de Champeau, who was able to attract his thousands of auditors from all parts of the civilized world and establish himself as the great metaphysician of his century, sailed too far into the channel of free thought that was beginning already to show signs of a rising flood. Abelard was too free an investigator to merit renown in the Church whose main pillar was authority; he was of too Protestant a spirit.

The night of obedience to absolute church authority was fast passing away. The morning of free inquiry was approaching. We seem to descry in Duns Scotus and John of Occam harbingers of the approaching dawn. Into the Thomists and Scott-

ists of the anti-revival period the Catholic world becomes divided. Research is fostered more and more, and the light of philosophy grows steadily brighter. The aurora of the new epoch advances; morning dawns, and the warriors arise and arm themselves for the impending struggle with scholasticism. The sun of free inquiry rises above the horizon. Philosophy begins the battle for its manumission from its masters, and co-habilitates itself in its ancient regalia. The Reformation with all its consequences was but the result of the re-enthronement of free inquiry and philosophical research. Luther and his reforming compeers must of necessity rise and lead the army of reason, or others will take their places. The work of the Reformation, or by whatever name it might be called, was inevitable; it was not the work of the German monk and his coadjutors, but of the age in which they lived. After the discovery of printing it became a necessity. It is true at first it might have been crushed out for a century, or even longer, as it was in some places before Luther's day, and as afterwards took place in Italy, Spain and France. But it must come at last. Like a swelling torrent it might have been checked as by a dam for a period, but in the end all opposition must give way, and the flood be permitted to take its course. Its progress is onward. It has been from the first up till the present steadily shearing the Catholic hierarchy of its power, and to what it will yet reduce it the future alone can tell. The strong Catholic citadel long and valiantly defended, the temporal power of the Holy See, has at length given way, and little doubt but forever.

It was a mighty force indeed that gave birth to the numerous churches and ecclesiastical organizations of the Reformation period; and one whose strength must ever increase with the onward march of time. If the indwelling force of free philosophical inquiry in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was sufficient to resist the shock of the united arguments and armies of the Catholic world, and was able to plant Protestantism in Europe, in the face of the terrific opposition it encountered; by what measure are we now to estimate its

present strength and magnitude? What obstacle could we conceive now sufficient to resist its onward progress? It seems indeed marked as the force that is to carry forward the destiny of our race.

After the establishment of the Reformation the task devolved upon philosophy to establish enlightened principles of biblical interpretation. With the dissemination of books that followed the discovery of printing, a mental activity soon spread over Europe that the world had not before witnessed. Men began to think and reason upon all questions then forming the curriculum of study, and theology amongst the rest came in for its share of investigation. By the reformers the great principle asserted, was the right of individual inquiry in opposition to absolute church authority. They, however, did not absolve themselves entirely from all authority. Instead of the authority of the Church, they made the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments the unqualified rule of their faith. These being now accepted by them as the absolute standard of authority, to the same their followers were implicitly required to subscribe. The principle of individual inquiry being once admitted, if the Reformers had the right to set up one standard of authority in opposition to the Catholic Church, then their followers were equally free to establish a different one. So long as this latter assumption was denied, the scholastic spirit remained unconquered. And such was indeed the fact. The reformers, though unconscious, were, whilst opposing scholasticism, themselves scholastic, and it remained as the task of the Christian philosophers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to erect free philosophical inquiry upon its ancient pedestal and accord it that position in investigation to which it is entitled.

The reformers made simply one advance towards the attainment of truth. Philosophy made another equally as important. This last was taken by Descartes, who must ever be regarded as the father of the modern mode of thinking. He set out by declaring that for the correct acquisition of truth, we must begin by first doubting everything. Bacon, Galileo, Leibnitz and all the eminent modern philosophers in general,

have *followed* this method. Copernicus and Galileo in their investigations as to the theory of the heavenly bodies, did not stop to inquire whether their deductions might conflict with any accepted theological dicta; it was sufficient for them to inquire if the correct laws of reasoning did not require of them new theories of astronomical revolution. The doctors of the church in vain raised their voices against the truths of philosophy that were one after another promulgated. The tide of investigation had set in, and a modification of the stern aspect of the ancient creeds was demanded in order to bring them into harmony with the unerring laws of reason. God's divine will and the history of His creation was imprinted upon all the works of His hand, and the book of His dictation must be found in unison with the impress of His writing upon the face of the universe. This harmony, the development and advance of modern science and philosophical research have shown; and the sublime beauty and conformity in the same are now to the scientific eye apparent in the word of divine truth, interpreted in the commentaries of universal nature. As thus seen, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are no longer in conflict with enlightened reason, and everything which seems so, in the estimation of the ablest and most sincere theologians of the present age, is as yet but imperfectly understood.

The enlightenment and liberalization of opinion has been effected by the advance of philosophy. Glance at the state of sentiment that reigned in Europe at the period when Luther and his followers began the great work of their reform. The shock of innovation that so almost instantaneously, as it were, burst upon the general vision of the Catholic world, aroused the ancient church to the necessity of exerting all its vigor and power in order to repress the new and threatening ideas of the age. The repression of all antagonistic opinions, by every means within reach, was resorted to by the dominant ecclesiastical organism. The means made use of were the same as had often been employed on former occasions; but the church now seemed to find itself necessitated to use more fre-

quent and strenuous exertion of the same instrumentalities that had crushed out Arianism; and had also repressed the Waldensian and other similar heresies. John Huss and Jerome of Prague who sank in the fires of Constance, were victims to the intolerant spirit of an unphilosophic age; and these two noble proto-martyrs must ever stand upon the records of time, as having greatly contributed in giving impetus to the movement of free inquiry, then preparing the reformation epoch. Again see illustrated the spirit of intolerance in the flames of Smithfield, the inquisitorial fires of Spain and Italy, and in the massacre of St. Bartholomew. The same was it, which excited the civil wars of France, with the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and its consequent national calamities; which drenched the Netherlands in the blood of its noblest citizens; and which inflamed the bloody and intestine carnage of the desolating thirty years' war of Germany. The Genevan reformer himself, although ranging himself in opposition to the dogmatism of absolute authority, had not yet caught the spirit of toleration which subsequent ages accepted as the boon of philosophical liberty. This, the flames in which Servetus expired, fully attest. Sect stands arrayed against Sect, with menacing looks of wrath, and it becomes the task of philosophy to disarm the contestants. This sovereign of the mind stepped forth in the writings of Montaigne, Spinoza, Bayle and their followers, and proclaimed a cessation of hostilities between the contending religious organizations, and henceforth toleration of opinion reared its head first in Holland, and afterwards in other parts of Europe.

Much as philosophical speculation has been derided and condemned, it has its part to perform on the arena of the world's progress; yea even those whose reputations stand blackened in the flames of the French revolution, performed worthy service in the hands of a higher destiny, in securing for universal humanity the right of free speech and the toleration of free opinion. The warring theologians might have still continued the strife against each other had not the spirit of philosophy interposed. As long as the doctrine, *ex ecclesia*

nulla salus, was maintained, no other result could be expected. When this was made to yield to a more enlightened and reasonable belief, the strife ceased. Sincerity of any honest opinion, as equally worthy, took its place, and liberty spread its wings over the world's wide domain.

One of the grand results of philosophical research has been the banishment of the myths and superstitions of past ages. The belief in sorcery and witchcraft was a superstition that bore for long centuries of duration tyrannic sway over the minds of all classes of mankind, and volumes of history swell with the narrations of the multitudes of innocent beings whose lives fell sacrifices upon the altars of deluded opinions. The parliamentary bodies of Paris, Toulouse, Bordeaux, Rheims, Rouen, Dijon and Rennes enacted laws for the suppression of magic and witchcraft within their dominions; and the pallid reaper of death that followed these decrees, crimsoned the streets and lanes of many a city and hamlet, and spread desolation and horror broadcast throughout the land. It is melancholy to remember that well-intentioned and upright judges, after days spent in sifting the evidence adduced before them, could sentence the innocent but convicted magician, with the same conscientious gravity, as would Lord Mansfield the blood-stained murderer. For these imaginary crimes, the existence of which the intelligence of the nineteenth century denies, seven thousand victims are said to have been burned at Treves, six hundred by a single bishop of Bamberg, and eight hundred in a single year in the bishopric of Wurtzburg. At Toulouse, where the inquisition had its seat, four hundred were executed for sorcery at one time, and fifty in the city of Douay in a single year. The executions which took place in the city of Paris in a few months were, in the expressive language of an old chronicler, "Almost infinite." The credulity which sanctioned the executions for these crimes was not confined to one country or people; for the Inquisition of Spain ended the career of many Parisian refugees who sought in flight safety in the sister country. In this delusion-ridden land the persecution spread to the smallest towns and villages, and so inveterate was the popular

superstition that a sorcerer was burned so late as the year 1780. Torquemada lent his energies as zealously to the extirpation of witchcraft as to that of heresy, and even wrote a book upon the enormity of the crime. The examples thus far enumerated indicate the attitude of the Church of Rome as regards these supposed crimes, but upon this ground the Reformers had no quarrel with their opponents. The credulity of Luther on this point was amazing even for his age. Speaking of witchcraft the Wittenberg Reformer uses the following emphatic and unhesitating language: "I would have no compassion on these witches," exclaimed he. "I would burn them all." In England the Reformation was the signal for the immediate outburst of the superstition; and there as elsewhere its decline was represented by a fanatical clergy as the consequence of increasing skepticism. In Scotland, where the reformed clergy exercised unbounded influence, the witch trials were very numerous, and the persecution remarkably atrocious. The ablest defender of the belief in witches probably was Glanvil, a clergyman of the Episcopal Church; and one of the most influential was the Puritan, Baxter. Puritanism imported the belief into the new world; and the executions in Massachusetts form one of the darkest pages of our occidental history. Even the distinguished founder of Methodism stands enrolled as one of the latest believers in the exploded superstition. All these superstitions, with other kindred notions, the intellect of the age, enlightened by the developments of science, and the metaphysical illuminations of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has cast aside; and he would be a bold man to-day indeed who in the face of the beaming intelligence of the present epoch would dare to express a belief in them. Equally as great a mad-man would he be regarded in intelligent estimation as he who should be found to call in question the truth of the Copernican system of the universe, or the Newtonian theory of gravitation.

But the grandest result of modern progress is the entire harmony that is come to be generally perceived by the Church between the deductions of philosophy and the truths of the Chris-

tian system. Owing to this agreement religion is found to be in no wise an exception to the general law of progress, but rather the highest form of its manifestation, and its earlier aspects but the necessary steps of an imperfect development. In this view the moral element of Christianity is as the sun in heaven, and dogmatic systems as the clouds that intercept and temper the exceeding brightness of its rays. Truth ever remains truth, but one period may more fully establish it than another. This is now seen in the general acceptance of truths once attested by but a few solitary teachers of the early Church. Christianity has no longer cause to dread the developments of science and philosophy. She, on the contrary, accepts them with triumphant alacrity, having no stereotyped standard to defend, and she regards the human mind as pursuing on the highest subjects a path of continual progress towards the fullest and most transcendent knowledge of the Deity. This conception of a continued and uninterrupted development has subsidized almost all the thinking of the age. It is stirring all science to its very depths, and is revolutionizing all historical literature. Pitiful is that school of theology indeed which is not influenced in one form or other by it. Even the Roman Catholic Church, whose fundamental basis is authority, is more or less made to yield to this dominant sentiment of the age. The rationalistic momentum of the world, itself widely divergent from the old Voltairean spirit, has but aided in bringing thought to this sublime conception, and all in the interest of liberalized Christian views. The great ideal of the Church is still coming into more distinct and clear recognition. Around it cluster the leading Christian conceptions of the period; equality, fraternity, the suppression of war, the elevation of the poor, the love of truth, and the general diffusion of liberty. The enemies of the truth thus, whilst laboring to destroy it, have simply aided in making it more luminous and brilliant, and again have verified the divine saying that "the Lord maketh the wrath of man to praise Him." The progress of the Christian Church is still onward, and it is "going forth conquering and to conquer." It has opened wide its motherly

arms, overthrown its enemies by their own logic, and embraces in its charitable folds its once most malignant persecutors. Their weapons, wrested from them, are now being burnished for use under the great Captain of their salvation, who is marching forth for the spiritual subjugation of the world. Persecution, for opinion's sake, is amongst the obsolete ideas of the past. The red sea of blood has been crossed; the Christian conscience, as the pillar of fire, is leading forward the race in charity, toleration and free opinion, and uniting mankind in a universal brotherhood where free thought and free speech are crowning the highest aspirations of man.

ART. V.—WOMAN'S CULTURE.*

BY REV. J. H. DUBBS, A. M., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—

We are told by travelers that, at the city of Coblenz, where the rivers Rhine and Moselle unite, the two streams seem loth to mingle, and may for miles be distinguished by the color of their waters, flowing side by side. In a somewhat similar way, there are occasions when a double stream of emotion comes in upon the soul, and when our feelings become indescribable, and are sometimes entirely beyond our control.

I am glad to be with you to-night; I rejoice to be permitted to speak words of cheer to the officers and members of an institution in which I take the deepest interest, and at a place which is to me the shrine of the fondest memories.

Yet, by the side of my rejoicing flows a little stream of sorrow, and the two currents absolutely refuse to mingle. I cannot help remembering how, twenty-three years ago, there was a somewhat similar assembly at this very spot, and how the

* An Address delivered before the Young Ladies of the Allentown Female College, Allentown, Penna., on Thursday Evening, June 27, 1872. Published by request.

heart of a certain boy, who then ventured for the first time "to speak in public on the stage," alternately thrilled with hope and fear. I cannot repress a feeling of sadness when I fail to recognize the familiar faces of many dear friends, who were with us then, but whom we shall nevermore behold on earth. With such fond memories the heart grows tender, and I dare not venture to dwell upon them:

"Bewegt mit Freud und Trauer—ach!
Die Dhrene kumme wann ich lach!
Kanscht denke wie ich siehl." *

You will not be surprised, then, if under the influence of such conflicting emotions, my remarks this evening should at times partake more of the nature of a sermon than of that of an entertaining address. Ministers are, at any rate, so accustomed to preaching, that in their discourses on miscellaneous topics, and even in ordinary conversation, they are in great danger of falling into the didactic style of the pulpit. The celebrated Coleridge, you may remember, attempted in early life to become a minister, but having utterly failed in the pulpit, he did the next best thing, and became a great philosopher and poet. He was, however, a prodigious talker, and when on a certain occasion he inquired of the genial author of "Elia," "Lamb, did you ever hear me preach?" he received, in Lamb's peculiar, stammering style, the cutting reply, "I never heard you do *anything else*."

Having chosen to address you on "Woman's Culture," I think, if I were preaching a sermon, I would select as my text that wonderful prayer of King David, in which, after expressing his desire that "the sons may be strong, like plants grown up in their youth," he adds the enlightened petition, "that our daughters may be as corner-stones, polished after the similitude of a palace." Nowhere else in antiquity can we find the true nature and object of *Woman's Culture* so clearly stated.

* "Both joy and sorrow fill my heart—
E'en when I smile the tears will start—
Alas! how strange I feel!"

—Harbaugh's "*Pennsylvania German Poems*."

When Solomon erected his magnificent temple at Jerusalem, he caused the outer porch to be supported by two great pillars, one of which was called Jachin and the other Boaz; and it has been held by some modern expositors, that they respectively signified strength and beauty, the pillars on which the Church and State depend. Man is Boaz and woman Jachin; man must perform the severest labors, while woman adds to them that polish and beauty without which they would at best be crude and incomplete.

Long, long ago, before the building of the temple of Diana at Ephesus, before the Parthenon reared its snowy crest on the heights of the Acropolis, this truth was fully acknowledged and exemplified by the architects of ancient Greece. They tell us, that the Doric column, which is plain and massive, signifies man; while the Ionic, slender and graceful as a lily-stem, represents woman, whose mission tis to prove the usefulness of the beautiful; for

"Wherever strength with beauty joins,
When with the rough the mild combines,
Then all is union, sweet and strong."

When we remember this ancient, and we may say, universal acknowledgment of the special mission of woman, and especially when we consider what she has done and is still doing for the Church and for the world—working for the most part as silently as the polypi in the depths of the ocean, and yet erecting monuments as mighty and enduring as the coral reefs themselves—is it not wonderful, that until a comparatively recent period, almost all genuine culture was denied her? Grecian and Roman history furnishes many examples of women of remarkable purity and patriotism, but the few women of talent and culture whose names are mentioned—such as Sappho and Aspasia,—were condemned, apparently for that very reason, to social ostracism. They seem to have been considered rather disreputable characters.

It was just so during the Middle Ages. We are lost in astonishment at the gigantic efforts which were put forth for the education of men; universities were established in every

country in Europe, and their students were numbered by thousands. There was everywhere a raging thirst for knowledge, and such a man as Abelard had but to announce his intention of lecturing, though it were at some obscure convent in the midst of trackless forests, and almost all the young men in the country would hasten thither to hear him, though at the danger of starving in the wilderness. All honor, then, to the noble men who brought about that revival of letters of which we still enjoy the precious fruits! But what did these great scholars accomplish for the culture of woman? Alas! nothing at all. In fact, they seem to have looked upon an educated woman as a sort of monster who, like a crowing hen, deserved nothing better than to have her head wrung off.

Those were the days when a Duke of Normandy, on hearing that a certain learned lady had successfully disputed with the professors in the University of Bologna, was not ashamed to say, that he thanked God that not one of the women of his family could read or write. Is it wonderful that women under such restrictions should have produced but few works of genius? "Not more than one hundred and fifty years ago, long after the establishment of Harvard University, a Massachusetts School Committee refused to permit girls to study arithmetic and grammar after the boys had been dismissed; and a little later, a teacher in Plymouth County, in the same state, was discharged for instructing girls to cipher, on the ground that their heads were too weak to stand the strain of mathematics. Is it surprising that woman should have remained a *cypher* when men were such *vulgar fractions*?"

If any man had been bold enough to speak in favor of female education in the days to which we have referred, he would no doubt have been compelled to fight his way step by step. He would have had to prove the capacity of the female mind for culture, and the necessity of due preparation for her work, which is no less important than that of man. It would have been necessary to ransack the annals of all nations to find examples of female heroism and genius; to remind the French-

man that to Joan of Arc he owed his national independence; to encourage the pride of the Englishman in

" Those melodious bursts that fill
The spacious times of great Elizabeth
With sounds that echo still."

We live in a different age, and any attempt of the kind would be labor lost. Prejudices are passing away like the mists of morning. The days are past when educated women were sneered at, until they became the cold, stern, angular beings they were popularly supposed to be; and I am sure, if Thomas Moore were still living he would not venture to paint the ideal educated woman as

" Mrs. Hopkins taking tea
And toast upon the wall of China."

We have come to feel that humanity constitutes a unit which is to be found complete neither in man nor woman separately considered, but in both; and that to neglect either of its developments is to stunt and deform the race. We are assured that to attempt to civilize the world without educating the mothers of succeeding generations, is a task which, like the rolling of the rock of Sysiphus, must be constantly renewed, and yet can never be fully accomplished.

The Female Colleges, and other institutions of a similar character, that are springing up all around us, prove that we are waking up to our duties in this respect, and though we occasionally encounter some crabbed old cynic, who calls such things "nonsense," we can now afford to turn the laugh on him in the full assurance of victory. The subject before us, therefore, narrows down to the consideration of the true nature and objects of woman's culture.

We may as well say first as last, that we have not come here to advocate any system of education which is contrary to nature. In the words of a distinguished divine, "We do not desire to make trumpets out of flutes, or sun-flowers out of violets." Let the greatest sculptor in the world attempt to transform an Ionic column into a Doric, and the result will be

a miserable, stumpy caricature, that will have lost its original beauty without having acquired the strength and massiveness of the object which it imitates. The culture which we advocate is of an entirely different nature, and has a very different object. Like humanity itself, it must in its original constitution be the same in both sexes, and yet in its further developments it must be true to its mission of bringing to light the peculiar powers and graces of the female mind and character.

1. In accomplishing this work we must be sure that we have laid a good foundation. If we neglect this we may, indeed, erect a structure as bright and glittering as the palace which the Empress Anne built of ice upon the frozen river Neva; but some fine day the foundations will give way, and the whole edifice will tumble into hopeless ruin. While it would be folly to deny the immense advantages of talent, beauty, wealth, and social position, in the case of those who are otherwise prepared for their mission, it would be worse than folly to make them the foundation of woman's culture. She seems, at any rate, to be in danger of attaching an undue degree of importance to things of this kind, which like the little idols which Rachel hid away when she left her father's house, are apt to prevent her from devoting herself earnestly to the service of Jehovah. The cultivation of such propensities, without having first laid a deep foundation of earnest piety, is sure to produce the most disastrous results. A serpent may be lithe and graceful, it may have beautiful eyes that sparkle like jewels, but it is a serpent still, and we shrink from it with horror. No one, I am sure, would hold up to our admiration, on account of their beauty, talent, and royal birth, such infamous personages as Messalina, Catharine de Medicis, Margaret of Valois, or Catharine II of Russia. There may be a certain fascination in reading about the career of such women, of whom there are, at any rate, enough in the world to furnish the originals of the heroines of such popular novels as *East Lynne* and *Lady Audley's Secret*; but still we would shrink from them with horror if we were to meet them personally in actual life. We all feel that,

"'Tis not the fairest form that holds
The mildest, purest soul within ;
'Tis not the richest plant that folds
The sweetest breath of fragrance in."

In short, we are all, I trust, agreed, that all culture is worse than wasted, unless it is based upon a firm, unwavering faith. The woman who would grow strong for the performance of her special work, must rely firmly on the Author of her existence. She must have a heart full of the love and the life of her blessed Lord. False to all the better instincts of her nature is she who rejects her Saviour's love. As the poet says :

"Oh, what is woman, what her smile,
Her joyous heart, her eye so bright,
What is she, if her lips revile
Jesus, the Lord of life and light ?
Without that meeker grace, she'll be
A lighter thing than vanity."

Only when her heart is unwaveringly fixed on the Saviour, when all the higher impulses of her nature cling to Him as the ivy to the oak, is it that Christ's strength is perfected in her weakness ; that she is worthy of being compared to a corner-stone "polished after the similitude of a palace." "Favor is deceitful and beauty is vain, but a woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised."

2. Having laid a substantial foundation, our next care must be to erect a superstructure that will be of a similar character. There is a kind of education, which is, strictly speaking, no education at all, that consists in the accumulation of miscellaneous materials, in the hope that they may possibly be of use in later life. Under this supposition the mind is crammed with a chaos of undigested facts and bits of knowledge, probably not understood and soon forgotten, and which generally constitute an effectual bar to all genuine culture. It was probably at an institution conducted in this way that a certain young lady received her "finishing" who, being asked the question at examination, "Did Dr. Luther die a natural death?" promptly responded, "No, sir; he was excommunicated by the Pope's bull."

It is not so much great learning that we desire for our daughters, as wisdom to use properly the knowledge of the things of every-day life. We do not wish their mind to be like a garret stored with useless lumber, but rather like a beautiful and well-arranged cabinet, in which every fragment of information at once finds its proper place, and is ticketed and labeled for future reference. Knowledge is everywhere—all nature is full of it. It comes tumbling in on our minds at every moment of our existence, and the problem is not how to get knowledge, but how to keep it, and how to apply it. Teach our girls how to gain and how to retain knowledge, and they will keep on learning all their lives, so that in old age their conversation and manner will possess a charm for which the belle of the season must long in vain.

When I send my daughters to the Allentown Female College to be educated—as I hope to do some day or other—I do not care to have them transformed into walking encyclopedias, though, of course, I expect them to acquire much useful information. But, above all things, teach them to think—not about the follies and fripperies of fashionable life—but to think logically, and to form a sound judgment on any subject that may be presented to their consideration. Let their training be catholic, but not diffuse. Suffer one branch of study to be a stepping-stone to the next, thus preserving the organic unity of the whole course. At the same time, however, let every pupil have ample room to develop the special talents which God has given her. A college curriculum may be so strict as to become a machine for breeding dullness. If there should, by any chance, be one of the pupils whose tastes and talents differ widely from those of the rest, let her not, like Andersen's "Ugly Duck," be pecked at by the whole flock. Remember, that she may finally turn out to be a swan, who will soar into higher regions than her companions can possibly reach. If, for instance, she is fond of the higher mathematics, give her time to indulge her inclinations, though you must abridge the music lesson, for which she shows no aptitude. We consider Caroline Herschel and Maria Mitchell, measuring the stars and

adding new members to our solar system, at least as worthy of admiration as some of the musical prodigies we sometimes meet at parties, who always claim to be out of voice and practice, and yet by dint of our earnest supplications, suffer themselves to be led to the piano, where they trill out for our delectation the latest Italian novelty. If one of the girls should be detected drawing clever caricatures of her companions, let her punishment be an extra drawing-lesson; though she may not develop into a great artist, like Rosa Bonheur or Harriet Hosmer, the possession of a delightful accomplishment will, at any rate, scatter rays of sunshine over her whole life, and aid her materially in the accomplishment of her glorious mission of making others happy.

3. The beautiful, in this way, becomes an important element in the culture of woman. It is necessary that she should be possessed of those gifts and graces that will enable her to exert her influence to the best advantage. A rough diamond is incalculably more valuable than a beautiful pebble, but there are few who can recognize its excellence. Not until it is polished by the skilled labor of the lapidary, is it deemed worthy of a place in a monarch's diadem.

But if, as we are told, the work of polishing a precious stone requires the utmost care, as the slightest accident may destroy the beauty of the gem, how much more skill and patience are necessary when we undertake to polish a human mind and soul.

There is a meretricious polish, which is but too easily acquired, and which is very apt to dazzle weak eyes. We do not refer to the insane devotion to fashion, which is characteristic of the present generation, and which manifests itself in "the kangaroo dip," or whatever else happens to be the fashionable contortion. That is no polish at all—it is nothing but a very thin French varnish, which Miss Bridget O'Flaherty, whose brother has made his fortune in America, has no difficulty in acquiring within six weeks after emigrating from her native bog.

But even the most delightful personal accomplishments may become false and deceptive, when they are made an end in

themselves, and are valued by the possessor only as a means of keeping up appearances. The brilliancy of a counterfeit jewel only increases our contempt, when we discover that the material is paste. While we have no desire to undervalue personal accomplishments, we insist upon it that they are valuable only in so far as they spring from thorough Christian culture. They must be the foliage of a sound and healthy tree, or they will not fail to prove sickly and offensive. We all instinctively feel that genuine courtesy does not consist wholly of graceful manners and a strict adherence to the laws of etiquette, but grows out of Christian self-denial, and consideration for the happiness of others.

In the same way, literary culture, to be agreeable in man or woman, must be genuine and unaffected. There must be no straining after effect—no use of high words and pompous phrases, in the hope of displaying great learning. The effect is apt to be directly the reverse. We are likely to agree with Jean Paul in his opinion that “people who use obscure language are like hosts who, whenever their wine is of inferior quality, present it to their guests in colored glasses, in the hope of thereby hiding the defect.”

Indeed, persons who converse in this way are in very great danger of making themselves ridiculous. A young lady who presided at a tea-table at which the Hon. Thomas Corwin, of Ohio, was a guest, supposing that she must employ big words in honor of the occasion, asked him the question, “Mr. Corwin, will you take *condiments* in your tea?” meaning, of course, cream and sugar. With a twinkle in his eye, but with all the solemnity in the world, the witty statesman responded, “A little pepper, but no mustard, if you please, ma’am!”

Let me assure you that the days have passed by when the standard dictionary of the English language defined so simple a word as “net-work” as “anything reticulated or decussated, with interstices between the intersections;” and when a thimble was described as “a metallic, truncated cone, semi-perforated by equi-distant indentations.” Chaste, simple language is always agreeable, while pedantry is everywhere avoided

by people of the highest culture. A mother in London took her sick child to an obscure young physician. He said: "I observe that your heiress has premonitory symptoms of incipient rubeola." She took her to the most famous physician in the city who said, "The child is going to have the measles." Mr. Taine tells us in his *Notes on England*, of a great French artist, who having spent several days in the company of a number of English authoresses of the first-class, such as Mrs. Gaskell, Miss Evans, Mrs. Browning, Miss Muloch, and others, was astonished to be informed that they were possessed of literary distinction. "He found them domestic ladies of very simple habits. Not once did a hint of authorship or the need of speaking of one's self or books, occur during twenty-four hours of talk." Being invited to the country, he discovered that the lady of the house knew more Greek than himself, apologized, and retired from the field; then, out of pleasantry, she wrote out his English sentence in Greek. "Alas!" continues our author, mournfully, "in France we believe too readily that if a woman ceases to be a doll, she ceases to be a woman."

It is because you desire your daughters to acquire a kind of culture somewhat resembling that which we have attempted to indicate, that you have established an institution of which you have every reason to be proud. We have had enough of institutions that poison or warp the mind—whether by skepticism or by superstition—and we, therefore, insist on a good, solid Christian education, that will preserve our daughters in the faith of their fathers and mothers, and make them better able to meet and solve the problems of life and death. Not that we would neglect those accomplishments which will better enable them to become a blessing to the circle in which they move; but we would have the ornamental to be the crown and glory of the substantial, and not the reverse.

It is not for us, of course, to attempt to indicate minutely the means whereby this is to be accomplished. That is the special task of the professors of this institution, in whose skill and patience I am happy to believe you place implicit confidence. We trust, that in their hands, guided by the grace of God, our

"jewels"—as the Roman matron called her children—will be polished and burnished, as by skillful lapidaries, until they glow like mirrors that reflect the glories of God's firmament above. Precious beyond comparison are such living stones in the sight of the Lord, and they shall be His, He tells us, "in the day when He makes up His jewels." May God grant this, their parents' fondest prayer, through Jesus Christ our Lord!

After all we have said, is it possible that there should still be some "old foggy" here present who will persist in asking the question, "*Cui Bono?*" Granted that genuine Christian culture is an end and blessing in itself, what practical results—what worldly advantages—do you expect to achieve with reference to the social condition of woman?"

To questions of this kind, let us say, that we have not come prepared to give an answer. They are not directly connected with our theme, and have become mere questions of political expediency, which our politicians will no doubt settle for us whenever they can thereby subserve the interests of their particular political party. Personally, we do not quite agree with Grace Greenwood, who says she is in favor of giving the right of suffrage, as a reward, only to such women as can in case of necessity "keep a boarding-house and support an invalid husband decently." While we appreciate the excellence of the service, we do not quite appreciate the excellence of the reward. Though it would be rather late in the day to assert the incapacity of woman to perform acceptably any public service, when there is not a single branch of literature or science in which she has not won the brightest laurels, she has, we think, a right to be excused from the performance of tasks which, at least, appear to conflict with that modest shrinking from publicity which is the chief charm of her nature:

"'Tis not to lead the battle on;
'Tis not to till the soil;
'Tis not to sit upon a throne,
Or share the victor's spoil;
'Tis not to speak to multitudes,
Or on the sea to roam;
No! None of these are woman's rights,
'Tis her's to rule at home."

We would give woman every right that she really desires. Let there be no discrimination between man and woman in matters of property and inheritance; let not narrow conventionalities prevent her from seeking in any honorable way to earn an honest livelihood. If she is gifted as an authoress, an artist, a painter, a sculptor, a musician—an orator, even—so be it! Let her have fair play!

But things of this kind do not constitute woman's mission, nor are they the objects of woman's culture. The highest aim of a true woman will be to be useful, wherever it may please Providence to order her lot. She cannot be satisfied to be a mere cumberer of the ground—to remain the only bee in a great industrious hive that gathers no honey. We are not speaking of physical labor, though even that is honorable. The mother of king Lemuel was, of course, a queen, and yet she does not hesitate to say of the model wife: "She looketh well to her household, and eateth not the bread of idleness."

There is, however, something besides food and raiment to be cared for in this probationary world of ours. The men of the present age seem to be almost entirely given up to the service of Mammon; let it be woman's mission to seek to check this spirit of utilitarianism—to bring man back to the true, the beautiful, and the good. Let her not be ashamed to labor in the cause of her Divine Master—the woman's Son—to whom she owes deliverance from the worst of slavery.

I sincerely trust, Young Ladies, that you will never imagine your sphere to be too narrow, or your influence too contracted. If you really aim to be useful there will be no lack of opportunities. Even to sit, like Mary, at the Saviour's feet, is to perform an acceptable service. Let your sympathies be active, not only towards those who are near and dear to you, but to all who suffer and need relief. Remember Phœbe, and Tryphena, and Tryphosa, who were proud to be called "the servants of the church," and Dorcas, whose lovely name has become the synonym of every lovely deed. On whom shall the church depend in her great philanthropic enterprises but on her daughters, who are always more ready to weep with those that weep and to rejoice with those that rejoice, than her sons,

whose hearts are apt to grow hard and selfish in the rough battle of life?

Wherever such an angel of mercy goes, her gentle presence will soften and subdue the spirit of the wicked as the music of David's harp quieted the passion of king Saul. Favors that would be indignantly rejected, if offered harshly or contemptuously, will awaken the warmest gratitude when presented by a cultured Christian woman. "Did she preach you a sermon?" inquired a soldier, during the late war, of a comrade who had just received a kindness from one of the volunteer nurses. "No use in preaching a sermon," responded the sufferer, "the woman is a powerful sermon herself."

We have not time to consider the influence of such a woman in her family and in her daily social life. Yet, who can fail to appreciate the blessings of a refined Christian home? Who can doubt that if such a woman is blessed with children, her Christian culture will tell powerfully on their education, life, and character? In short, wherever women of true culture may reside, they are the bright polished corner-stones of society, teaching the world by their innocent cheerfulness, that Christianity is not synonymous with melancholy; but that "the children of the king" have every reason to rejoice in their Father's favor, and in the certainty of a glorious inheritance. Surely, when we find among the results of woman's culture, that it makes faith stronger, home happier and heaven surer, we need not seek further to find others.

I am glad that an institution devoted to such objects has been founded in this city. I rejoice that the Reformed Church, of which I have the honor to be a minister, has been instrumental in its establishment. It will prove a blessing to your children and your children's children, and I bespeak for it your cordial sympathy and support.

And now, Young Ladies of the Allentown Female College, having brought you my imperfect offering, and having once more bid you and your worthy professors, God speed! in your noble work, I feel that my part in the exercises of your commencement is—ended.

"My simple chaplet, now no longer mine,
I leave to bloom or wither at your shrine."

ART. VI—THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL MOVEMENT IN ITS RELATION TO THE CAUSE OF EDUCATIONAL RELIGION.

BY REV. J. SPANGLER KIEFFER, HAGERSTOWN, MD.

THE recent improvement in Sunday-schools deserves the respectful and grateful recognition of all Christian people. It is not long since the Sunday-school was an obscure and neglected institution. Thought, time, and means were but scantily expended upon it. Any accommodations, however insufficient; any refuse religious books, however unsuitable; any teaching, however incompetent, were deemed good enough for the Sunday-school. There was little private interest, and no public enthusiasm in its favor. What character and usefulness it possessed in those days, was given it by a few humble, laborious, self-denying persons, whose memory is to this day a sacred treasure in many a heart throughout the land. But it lacked the necessary facilities to do its work efficiently; it pined under neglect; and so, as an institution, it had a feeble and sickly existence, as a plant of generous nature is languishing and stunted for want of nurturing care.

A few years have wrought a remarkable change. The Sunday-school has grown into a prominent and important institution. Both privately and publicly it has gained for itself recognition, interest, and enthusiasm. Time, talents, and money have been unsparingly expended for its advancement. Its literature, its teaching and its government have engaged the attention, and enlisted the labor of many of the best men in the country. The work has been organizing itself and seeking for the advantages of system and uniformity. County and State Conventions are held, in which the leading questions relating to the Sunday-school are discussed with great earnestness, and general conclusions, so far as possible, arrived at. A

most laudable zeal is manifested in seeking to gather in all poor and neglected children ; in establishing Sunday-schools in destitute places, and in furnishing libraries to those too poor to purchase them. The increased activity is particularly noticeable in the field of Sunday-school literature, where we find the most astonishing multiplication of religious books for the children, the number of library, music, and text books being already large and constantly increasing. One of the best indications of all, is the amount of earnest, humble, unobtrusive labor in the Sunday-school, performed regularly and not without self-denial, by Christian people.

It is not strange that, commingled with so much that is excellent and admirable, there should be much also that is unworthy and trivial. The mode of conducting Sunday-schools, the nature of Sunday-school teaching, and the character of Sunday-school publications, have recently been much criticised by good and thoughtful men, sometimes, perhaps, with undue severity, but yet, it must be acknowledged, with considerable justice. It may, we think, be reasonably questioned whether the attempt to render religion easy, popular and pleasant, has not been carried in the Sunday-school further than is wise ; whether it is not dangerous to cultivate an exaggerated taste for the "funny" in matters of religion ; and whether the jolly and frolicsome manner in which it is often thought necessary to carry on the work is productive of the best results. The effort to render religion cheerful and sunny for the young people is undoubtedly legitimate ; but when it is sought to make religious instruction prevaillingly an amusement, there is room seriously to consider "whether, when we teach religion in the way of sport, our pupils may not thereby be gradually induced to make sport of their religion." It will scarcely be denied that, in the multitude of Sunday-school books, there is a vast amount, not only of useless rubbish, but of literature that is positively injurious, and calculated to beget and foster a false and pernicious taste for trivial reading, and a distaste for the Word of God and religious books of the better order. Whole schools have been poisoned and demoralized in this way ; on

this account superintendents and officers find the selection of libraries a most difficult task; and many feel that in the former times of more scanty libraries, and more thorough study and committing to memory of the Scriptures, there was still something which may be thought of with regret. Nor can it be considered a favorable sign that the hymns which are sung in the Sunday-school are forever changing; that there seems to be little taste for those hymns which ages of use have proved the best adapted to express the devotional feelings of Christians; that the liveliest tune is generally the most popular; and thus the most popular hymn too often, alas, the one that is most trivial and has in it the least of the spirit of worship. Moreover, it could scarcely be otherwise, in present circumstances, than that much of the Sunday-school teaching should be incompetent; some of it not only incompetent, but misleading. It is to be mentioned, also, that, in the general spirit of the movement, there is much that is censurable and unworthy of the cause. This is especially perceptible in the conventions, in which are found those faults which usually accompany religious enthusiasm. The proceedings of these conventions often remind one, both amusingly and painfully, of the fabled Mutual Admiration Society. In the numerous speeches there is often an unpleasant magnifying of self, and a painful want of humility and reverence. Amid much that is earnest, humble, and worthy of all praise, this is found to be a favorable field, also, for the demonstrations of that spirit which is self-confident, arrogant and loud; which hesitates not to speak in its own praise; which sees no possibility of danger or mistake; and scruples not to call sharply to account the Church and the Ministry, if they seem not at once to have the same views, and adopt the same means with reference to the furthering of the great cause.

Another peril to which the Sunday-school movement is exposed ought to be mentioned here; the more so, because it is a peril of which few, if any, of its leaders, show signs of being aware. We cannot, however, do more than hint at it here, for to bring it fairly to light would require a long discussion. We believe, with one who has written thoughtfully and earn-

estly upon the subject,* that the imparting of religious instruction must, in order to be successful, be characterized by a certain necessary *reserve*. This is shown by the example of our Saviour, who, though He went about extremely desirous to disclose Himself, was yet forever hiding Himself; who revealed Himself only in proportion to the susceptibility of men to receive Him; and who could not make Himself known unreservedly and indiscriminately for fear of the most disastrous consequences. It cannot be otherwise with the communication of religious truth. Such communication can take place safely and successfully only where a certain sacred reserve is at the same time cautiously and reverently maintained. The truth, while seeking to disclose itself, and just in order that it may disclose itself, finds it necessary often to withhold and hide itself; and injury must ensue wherever there is a violation of this infallible principle. If this be so, one cannot look without concern and fear, upon the absolutely unreserved and indiscriminate style in which the Sunday-school movement seems to deem it necessary to proceed in the imparting of religious instruction. It seems to be acknowledged as a principle that nothing is to be withheld. The most sacred things are handled without anything of concealment or restraint; and it seems to be regarded not only as permissible, but as an imperative duty, to put forward at all times, boldly and without reference to circumstances, the most awful and unfathomable doctrines of the Christian religion. One cannot look upon these things, we say, and not fear what the ultimate result may be, of a method so contrary to that of our blessed Saviour. Without being able to explain ourselves at length upon this point, we are convinced that a great peril exists here, and it is mournful to think that it is one of which the movement itself seems to be wholly unconscious.†

* See, in the "Oxford Tracts," the one entitled, "On Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge."

† It would not be just to represent this dangerous method as peculiar to the Sunday-school movement; for this only partakes of it in common with much of the prevailing Christianity of the times. What has been said of the movement in question, may be said with equal truth of much of the preaching of the day, and of the means in general by which it is sought to diffuse a knowledge of the gospel.

Such are some of the imperfections, faults and dangers of the movement; notwithstanding which, as we have already said, it embraces so much of moral earnestness and a true desire to do good, as to be worthy of the respect and gratitude of all.

At present, however, we are concerned with the movement, only as it is related to the cause of Educational Religion. For it is plain that the deeper significance of the increased attention and interest which the Sunday-school has of late been calling forth, lies in this, that the irrepressible truth of what is known as educational religion is thus coercing for itself the recognition of its claims. The religious world is awakening to the fact that a vast and most promising field of Christian activity has, to a great extent, been lying neglected. It is coming to be realized that the age of childhood and youth is a vantage ground for the Christian religion, the importance of which has not been fully appreciated; that it is a strong fortress which there has been too much disposition to leave for a time in the undisputed possession of the enemy. Under the influence and inspiration of this newly-awakened feeling, Christian people of almost all denominations, have, it seems, been girding themselves for more earnest labor in this hitherto imperfectly cultivated field. Thus the Sunday-school, which, in a certain sense, presides over the religious life of children and youth, has come to be invested with a new character and quickened with a new life. It is not what it was in its earlier years; it is regarded in a different light, animated by a different spirit, and managed in a different way. That there is such a marked contrast between the past and the present, in the history of the Sunday-schools, no one, we think, will deny; and few, we suppose, would refuse to acknowledge, that at the root of this change lies the change which has come over the views of Christian people, with regard to the relation of children and youth to the all-important interest of religion. The movement itself, indeed, does not hesitate to avow such a change as we have described. There are not wanting acknowledgments, on the part of representative Sunday-school men, to the effect that, in the past, a mistake was made in the manner in which childhood was

regarded, or disregarded, in a religious sense ; and that now it needs to be viewed in a different light and treated in a different manner. It has been too much the custom (it is confessed) to look to maturer years as the proper sphere for the operation of God's grace, while the religion of children has been regarded with suspicion, or, at most, as an exceptional phenomenon. Now, however, not only is the age of childhood regarded as a legitimate sphere for the operations of God's Spirit and grace, but it is just that sphere in which the largest results may be expected as the recompense of Christian activity. The religion of children is now looked upon without suspicion, as something normal, having a nature of its own, and calling to be provided for with special appliances and care.

In proof of the fact that such a change of mind is acknowledged to have taken place, we would refer to the published proceedings of the Eighth Annual Convention of the Maryland Sunday-school Association. We make use of the proceedings of this Convention, both because they happen to be the nearest at hand, and because the Convention in question, having been, by common consent, one of the most successful of all that have hitherto been held, may be considered fairly representative in character.

At one of the sessions of that Convention, the Rev. L. W. Bacon, of Baltimore, delivered an eloquent address, which was received, it seems, with universal approbation and applause. From this address we make the following quotation :

" It is painful to think what mistakes have been made even by the greatest and best of men on this cardinal question. Turning back the records of the Church of Christ, we are as those who, reading in the strata of the rocks the history of God's work in the creation, come now and then upon the relics of some horrid and repulsive monster. There occurs to me just now one of the fairest pages of the history of the Church, that on which the illustrious Jonathan Edwards wrote the story of that unquestionably divine work, which was wrought through the preaching of himself, and of the Tennents and Wesley and Whitefield, the event known in American history as ' The Great

Awakening." Amid the memorials which he gives of God's grace working upon one heart and another, he mentions, as a thing quite out of the course, not only of nature, but of grace, the story of a little girl of four years old, who passed in successive stages through all the phases and symptoms of a religious experience as those symptoms were laid down by the doctors of that day; from carelessness to seriousness, from seriousness to gloom, from gloom to despair, and then (after a sufficient interval) from despair to joy and peace in believing; and the good man tells the story with the evident conviction that that was the regular and only correct way for a little child to enter the kingdom of heaven, but that it was not much to be expected that many of them would come by that course.

"Alongside of this story, let me put another of a different sort, but illustrating the same point. One of the most eminent and beloved of the pastors of New York City was telling me in a little confidential circle of brethren, the beautiful story of his Christian experience: how with the earliest dawn of recollection he became conscious of a deep, tender love for God his Father and Christ his Saviour; how this feeling grew with his childish growth and strengthened with his strength; how in later years there were variations and fluctuations of feeling, and crises of religious experience, which had made him suspect that at such or such a time he was converted, and first began to be a Christian; but how, as his knowledge and experience had grown, he had settled clearly in the conviction that if ever he had known the grace of God, he had known it from the time of those earliest recollections. A few days after this, I met the venerable father of my friend on Broadway, and told him that his son had been telling me the story of his religious life. 'Oh no, he hasn't,' said the good old man; 'he can't remember that story. Only his mother and myself can tell it. It goes back to his cradle!' Who will undertake to say at what point such a life may not be begun by the inworking of the Holy Spirit?

"But mark what sort of reception this sort of Christian meets with in the church! We are not prepared to expect divine grace in the mouth of babes and sucklings; and so when we see

the signs of grace there is nothing to be done but to put the subject of them into the category of grown-up Christians at once. We forget that regeneration does not change a child into a grown-up person but only changes it into a *Christian child*, but just as much a child for all that. 'And so,' said my friend, 'they did all they could to ruin me.' They made an 'infant phenomenon' of him. In that great metropolitan Presbyterian Church they stood him up on a bench to make public prayers in the prayer-meetings as soon as he could talk plain. In short, they gave full illustration of the fact that the Church of our day does not know the art of caring for Christian little children."

To hear such words is encouraging, especially to those who have maintained, while others virtually denied, the possibility of a religious development, beginning with earliest childhood; and who have believed such to be, not the exceptional but the regular and normal course of the Christian life. Those who, in dark and evil times, have continued to cherish the idea and maintain the practice of educational religion, will welcome as the sign of returning day such a recognition of what has so long been disregarded and denied.

There is room, however, to inquire whether this is a true and full, or only an apparent and partial, recognition of the claims of educational religion. "Truth, crushed to earth, will rise again," indeed; but how often it rises only in the form of a new perversion, or to stand in wrong relations. This is the fearful advantage of error, in its conflict with truth, that it has power to turn the victories of truth into its own victories, and that it is often only after having been repressed, and baffled and perverted a thousand times, that the truth comes to a full and proper emergence. Let us inquire whether this may be the case in the present instance. To do so, it will be necessary first to make some observations on the general subject itself.

Is there any room for religion to be educational? This is a question which carries in itself the strong presumption of an affirmative answer. For the natural supposition would be that Christianity, being meant for man, would own and have power

to appropriate whatever belongs essentially to human life. The famous saying of the heathen writer "*Homo sum ; humani nil a me alienum puto*," is true, in an especial sense of Christ and His religion. It is also a question upon which there is much of a practical nature depending. For it is easy to see how much is gained for Christianity, if there is anything in it corresponding to what education is in the sphere of our natural life; what increase of power it obtains if it can make its own one of the profoundest, most general and most powerful forces which have to do with our human life; how much more extensive is its dominion, if, in an educational form, it is capable of commencing with the very commencement of human existence.

If there is any possibility for religion to exist in this form, there is one thing which, unquestionably, it must presuppose and in which it must have its ground. Such religion must rest upon the basis of the actual presence beforehand, in some real sense, of what it proposes to bring to pass in the way of Christian character and life. It is true of all education that what it seeks to realize, is, from the beginning, at hand, and that whatever results it may end in will be found to be only such as were in principle already present when the process began. "As a stone cannot be cultivated into a plant, and as no training again can cause a plant to become an animal; so in the spiritual world, it is not possible, by mere nurture of any sort, to carry the evolution of life beyond the principles and germs which are already imbedded in its own constitution."* Educational religion presupposes thus the germinal and virtual presence beforehand of the Christian life which it aims to develop. In other words, in order to produce Christians, by any process of cultivation, it is necessary, first of all, that there should be Christians in some sense to begin with.

If this is a paradox, it is at least a thoroughly scriptural one. For what has been said coincides entirely with what God's word teaches and implies with respect to the subject. It has been well remarked that the state of those to whom the

* Dr. Nevin's "Historical Introduction to the Heidelberg Catechism."

Apostles write, "is marked by the singular characteristic that they need to *become* what they *are*." In one sense, they *are* "saints;" in another, they need to *become* "holy." They *are* the "children of God," but they must also *become* His children. They *are* "dead unto sin," but they need to "mortify the old man." They *are* "risen with Christ," but they are exhorted to arise and "walk in newness of life." And all this in such a way that the possibility and necessity of their becoming what is set before them as their destiny and duty, grounds itself in what they are solemnly declared already to be. The seeming contradiction of this disappears when we distinguish between the presence of life in principle and germ and the presence of the same life in a state of development and activity; and consider that the latter always has its ground in the former. The acorn is, in an important sense, an oak; but it needs also to *become* what it is, that is, to be unfolded into a full-grown tree. An infant is, without any figure of speech, a man; for it carries all the powers of manhood wrapped up in itself; but it must also become a man, in the sense of having its slumbering faculties and powers awakened, developed, and brought into actual exercise. And, in either case, the possibility of any such process of becoming depends upon the fact that all which it is thus sought to actualize is present from the start in a real though embryonic, form. Not otherwise is it with the Christian life. Here, also, one *is* a Christian, that he may *become* a Christian; a Christian, first, in idea, principle and germ, that he may become one in actual repentance, faith, love and obedience. And the power, if such there be, of producing Christian character and conduct by the means of education and training, depends upon the existence of this anterior and underlying state.

If this be correct, if educational religion is not possible, except as having Christians, in some sense, to begin with, a most important inquiry is, whence comes this antecedent and fundamental Christian character or condition? In undertaking the work of educational religion, how shall we be assured that that basis is at hand without which all our work will be mistaken and in vain?

Very plainly, this prior presence of grace is not to be found in our nature as such. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." Because our nature is a fallen and sinful one, it contains the seeds of death, not of everlasting life ; and there is in it no possibility of being changed and transformed by any training or education whatsoever. To attribute to it any such possibility is an error, which, we suppose, would be cordially and emphatically disavowed by those with whose opinions we are dealing.

It may be said, however, that the first advent of grace into our nature, and the earliest establishment of that gracious relation, without which we have seen educational religion to be an impossibility, comes with the repentance and faith of the individual. To this it is to be replied, that educational religion, in the proper sense of the term, contemplates the possibility of beginning as soon as there is possibility of education in any sense, and, thus, before the acts of repentance and faith are possible ; and, further, that, instead of presupposing repentance and faith as necessary to its own existence, it belongs to the idea of religion, in this form, to call forth and develop these activities together with all else that pertains to the Christian life. Evidently that cannot be the antecedent basis of the process, which is a part of the process itself.

Not in nature, and not in an act or experience which is capable of taking place only at a more or less advanced stage of human life ; but in a divine transaction which is intended to coincide with the commencement of our being, do we find the foundation for which we are seeking. Those who believe in and practice educational religion, in its true sense, find the ground of its possibility in Baptism, and have never claimed for it validity or power, apart from the reality of Baptismal Grace. And, certainly, if there is any room to deal with religion in the way of which we speak ; if there exists the possibility of making Christians, in any true sense, by cultivation or training, this is the point where that possibility lies. Either there is no necessity for such a foregoing gracious relation, which we have disproved ; or, it is found elsewhere, which we have shown is

not the case ; or it must lie in what the Church has always regarded as the initiatory and fundamental act of religion, in the first transition from the realm of "the flesh" to the realm of "the Spirit," namely, in the sacrament of Baptism. If this be so, then not only must baptism confer grace, but such grace as to carry with it the presence, in principle, of the new man, and the possibility and beginning of that glorious process which embraces the forgiveness of sins, repentance, faith, love, obedience, sanctification by the Holy Ghost, and which has its completion in the "resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting." How beautifully the ground of this process and the process itself, are set forth in the Collect for Trinity Sunday : "O God, the Creator and Saviour of the world, who hast made Thyself known in the work of man's redemption, as the mystery of the ever adorable Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, Three in One and One in Three ; reveal in us, we beseech Thee, the full power of this faith, into which we have been planted by baptism, that, being born of water and of the Spirit, we may by a life of holiness be formed into Thine image here, and rise to Thy blissful presence hereafter, there to join with the song of the seraphim, in praising Thee, world without end."

It is needless to say that when those who believe in the reality of educational religion look upon baptism in this light, as a being ingrafted into Christ, as a being transplanted into the world of grace, and as bestowing, in germ, the presence of a true and complete Christian life ; this is only because such is believed to be the testimony of God's word. Our Saviour's solemn words, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God ;" His command to "make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ;" the reiterated allusions to baptism in connection with the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost ; all these compel the belief that the necessary initial transition from the realm of the flesh to the realm of the Spirit lies in this sacramental transaction. Moreover, what is thus more than once distinctly expressed in the Scriptures, is, in the most remarka-

ble manner, everywhere implied. It is plain that the Apostles presuppose those to whom they write to be in a state of grace. They are all "in the Spirit;" they have all "put on Christ;" which is made to be the ground and motive of their walking in the Spirit and leading lives of holy obedience. Now, what constituted them all one in the enjoyment of this fundamental gracious and responsible relation? Not their repentance, for it is made to be the ground of their repentance; not their holiness, for it is urged as the reason of their leading holy lives, which it is known many of them were far from doing; but only in this, for only in this were they all, without discrimination, *one*, that they had been "baptized into Jesus Christ."

If this be what the word of God teaches and implies, it is plain that baptismal grace lies at the root of educational religion; that it is, so to speak, the principle of its being; that it is that without which there is no room to conceive of religion in this form. It is this which furnishes what we have seen the idea of educational religion absolutely demands, namely, the presence beforehand of the principles and germs of a Christian life, to be called forth by religious training.

This brings to our view the educational process itself, the process by which one who *is* a Christian, in consequence of his covenant relation, is to *become* one in the way of developed Christian character and actual Christian experience. Educational religion takes it for granted that the baptized child is a Christian, acts upon this assumption, and seeks to afford it such Christian nurture as may awaken and call forth into activity the possibilities of divine grace that lie slumbering within it. The seed, in order to grow, needs the light, and the warmth, and the moisture; not otherwise does the child of grace require for its growth the light, and warmth and moisture and all the holy influences of the world of grace in the bosom of which it stands. It needs to be brought up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." It needs a warm bosom of religious life, the sunshine of a Christian home, and the influence of Christian example. It needs to be taught to pray, to be instructed in the doctrines and duties of religion, to be guarded with sacred care

against every incipient sin. It needs, not to be taught that it is its duty, at some future time, to "come to Christ," as if it had never come to Him at all (which would be a fatal mistaking of its position); but, as a child of God, it needs to be constantly reminded that it is its *present* duty to be loving and faithful and obedient to God. It must be given to feel, not that it is one who may be expected sooner or later to become a Christian, but that, as a Christian, it may be expected already to be living, in its own way, as a Christian ought to live. All instructions and admonitions must be based upon the fact that it has already "come to Christ" and received the grace of God. And it is easy to see how these admonitions, when made from such a basis, have a peculiar power which otherwise they would not possess. Take a seed, bury it in the dry dust, and expect it to grow, and you expect an impossibility. Take a homeless, fatherless and friendless child, and exhort it to filial affection and obedience, and you do but mock. But place the seed in good soil, and you may then expect it to grow. Take a child, with father and mother, and in the warm bosom of the family, and urge it to be affectionate and obedient, and your words mean something then. So, approach a child, as one standing outside of the covenant of grace, and never having come to Jesus, and exhort it to be loving and obedient, and your words are shorn of their force; they sound like mockery. But deal with it as with one who is "in the Lord," one who is in the bosom of "the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God and the communion of the Holy Ghost;" urge it, because of this, to flee from sin, to love and obey God; and the exhortation will come home to the heart with a peculiar power and have a grasp upon it which otherwise it could not gain.

Experience, we think, proves that, where this course is pursued; where earnest account is made of baptismal grace and baptismal obligations; where there is a genuine Christian nurture in the family and in the Church, by instruction, by admonition, and by example, there the most precious results are sure to follow. Under the influence of such Christian training, the grace which came almost with birth itself, begins

to unfold itself gradually and beautifully into a Christian life. When the child awakens to a sense of its relation to its God and Saviour, and begins to realize its privileges and responsibilities as a baptized person, it is found that, ordinarily, it comes to a knowledge of sin and penitence for it, and manifests a willingness and a desire to yield itself, in faith and obedience, to the Lord. Baptism is succeeded by confirmation with its solemn vows, and the use of the Holy Communion and the other means of grace continues, deepens and strengthens the reign of grace in the heart. Where the necessary conditions are most faithfully observed, this process will generally be gradual, continuous and almost imperceptible; silent, according to the analogy of all growth, in proportion to its depth and power. In many cases, however, it will be accompanied by inward crises, more or less violent, of religious experience; and sometimes, especially when Christian training has been imperfect or wanting, the result will be reached at last, where it is reached at all, by the abrupt breaking-through of long-resisted grace and the sudden conversion from a life of sin. But, with only such exceptions as prove the rule, the process of educational religion is one which starts with baptismal grace, and, by Christian nurture, in the bosom of the Church, gradually develops therefrom a piety which grows with the growth and strengthens with the strength.

The history of those branches of the Christian Church which have maintained the old faith in sacramental grace and the ancient practice of catechetical instruction, proves that a sound, healthy and vigorous piety is best developed in this way. We venture the assertion that the greater part of the best, most symmetrical, most vital religion of the present day, has had its growth in this quiet and undemonstrative manner. And it is somewhat remarkable that, even in those denominations whose custom it has been to despise catechetical instruction and everything that savored of educational religion, many of the most conspicuous, honored and trusted Christian men are those whose piety has come to them in this way.

When, now, after having been engaged in the study of this subject, we return to the movement whose merits we are considering, and inquire whether it be, what it seems to be, a recognition of the truth of educational religion, we must reluctantly confess that this does not appear to be the case. If what has been said is correct, it is plain that the possibility of forming Christians by religious training has its root in the reality of baptismal grace; and that, if this be denied, there is no room for the conception or the practice of educational religion, in any true sense of the word.

Now, it is certainly remarkable that a movement which bears the appearance of advocating educational religion; which seems to make vast account of the religious interests of childhood, and the possibility of a religious life beginning to develop itself already in the years of infancy; should, first of all, set aside the sole fact upon which the possibility of such a religious development must depend. We are not aware of any instance in which this movement has made open, or even implied acknowledgment of that in which its work of educational religion (if such it is intended to be) would be compelled to ground itself. We do not remember to have heard, in any S. S. Convention, or to have seen in the proceedings of any such Convention, or to have read in any document accepted as representing the Sunday-school cause, any distinct or indistinct declaration of the reality of baptismal grace. On the contrary, so far as we are able to comprehend the general spirit of the system, we judge that such a declaration would be rejected with marked disapprobation and displeasure. It is evident from this, that, however the religion which the Sunday-school cause owns and advocates may be educational in appearance, it is not so in reality. Notwithstanding seeming resemblances, it is not that of which we have been speaking as educational religion.

Nor, when we inquire more closely, does it appear that the movement professes to believe in or to practice anything of this sort. It is consistent at least in not pretending to do what its very stand-point leaves no room for. What it aims at, is, after

all, something very different from what the friends of educational religion might at first have expected and hoped.

What, then, *does* it seek to accomplish?

If we consult the statements of those to whom we must look for information, they do not seem, strictly taken, to be quite at one among themselves. For example, in the proceedings before us, we seem to discern two separate and distinct objects set forth, each as the end to be accomplished. In a leading address there occurs the following passage: "The problem we study, is, how to take this childhood, with its imagination, and love, and faith, and restlessness, and so train and restrain and teach it, that *it may result in a Christian manhood or womanhood.*" This appears to be an intentional and deliberate statement of the object, which one might therefore expect to be sufficiently guarded; and it would seem to declare that it lies in the power of religious training, and is the purpose of such training, so to mould and direct the natural child, that a Christian may be the result. This, of course, is nothing else than the old heresy of Pelagianism; and it would be bad enough, certainly, if the Sunday-school movement were to plunge itself bodily into this gulf. We are convinced, however, that this utterance must not be taken (though it seems to be such) for a guarded and authoritative statement of the problem. Rather, it was a vague and careless declaration; it would not be accepted as official; and, indeed, it is virtually contradicted in a subsequent portion of the same speech. It is unnecessary, therefore, to dwell upon this erroneous representation of educational religion here, seeing it is not rightly owned by those whose views we are discussing. But it is worth while to refer to it in connection with this subject, because of the general vagueness which makes such statements possible, and because one must fear that much of the prevalent opinion respecting the object of religious training is unconsciously of this heretical order.

Setting aside this and similar statements as careless and not official, we find substantial agreement among the representatives of this cause, in declaring the object to be *the conversion*

*of the child.** The aim of all religious training of children, it is said, is to "bring them to Jesus." This, we may say, is universally accepted as the true aim of Sunday-school work, and these words, indeed, have become a sort of common watch-word among Sunday-school workers. Now, this phrase is a good one, and, taken by itself, would be readily accepted, even by those whose conception of educational religion we have been describing, as a true and correct statement of the necessary object of all religious instruction. For these, in all their religious training of the young, would acknowledge themselves to have no other object in view than to bring them to Jesus Christ their Saviour. To "bring them to Christ," to "make them Christians," is a terminology which they can consistently and cordially adopt. But, when we consider the sense in which these words are taken, there comes to view at once a broad difference between the two sides. For it is plain that the movement in question proposes to bring the children to

* At this convention an address was delivered by Rev. Dr. Fuller, of Baltimore, in which there occurs the following passage: "The one aim of the Sunday-school teacher must be the real conversion of the child. Some are satisfied with teaching the Catechism; but nothing is really done for eternity, until the being who is 'by nature a child of wrath' becomes by grace a child of God."

This is certainly a distinct declaration of the object of Sunday-school teaching, but it is at the same time a glaring misrepresentation of the friends of educational religion and catechetical instruction. How can they be said to be "satisfied with teaching the Catechism," who hold it as a principle that neither catechetical instruction, nor Sunday-school teaching, nor any religious training whatsoever, can have power as a means of making Christians, apart from the fact of the previous grace of God given in Baptism? Certainly, this is very different from being "satisfied with teaching the Catechism."

The above extract seems to be a great magnifying of the grace of God over against those who are supposed to rely upon other means. How much truth there is in this will appear when we oppose to the misrepresentation of this random and reckless antithesis a statement which is just, we think, to all the parties concerned. Educational religion relies, *first of all*, upon the grace of God sacramentally given beforehand; and *then* upon Christian nurture (embracing catechetical instruction and all other educational instrumentalities) as the necessary means by which this grace is to unfold itself and be turned to practical account. The Sunday-school movement relies *first* upon religious instruction, and *then* upon the Holy Spirit, "seconding these efforts," to bring about the conversion of the child. Let any impartial person decide which of these two systems, in its work of teaching the young, gives the prior and higher place to the grace of God.

Jesus, as those who have never, in any sense, been brought to Jesus before; to make them Christians, as those who are not, in any real way, Christians at the time. What is aimed at, is the conversion of the child, as the independent starting-point, altogether in the future, of the Christian life. Not only is it not taken for granted that the children who are to be made Christians, are Christians already, but this seems to be especially guarded against, as an absurdity and a dangerous error, while it is supposed, and hoped and prayed for, that the instructions which are given, being "seconded" (according to the speech last quoted from) by the Spirit of God, may lead to their eventually becoming "new creatures in Christ Jesus."

Now, if what we have said be true; if educational religion is the nurturing process by means of which one who is a Christian in principle and germ becomes a Christian in the actual possession and practice of repentance, faith, love and obedience; then it is easy to see that we do not find educational religion here. The Sunday-school movement cannot deny the one fact which alone gives vitality and power to religious instruction, as a means of making Christians, and yet find it possible to practice educational religion. Where the reality of baptismal grace is denied, and the real though embryonic Christian character of baptized children disowned, there is no room to make religion educational in any true sense of the word. Consequently, when the Sunday-school movement, in dealing with the religious interests of the young, seems to be so thoroughly educational, this is necessarily more in appearance than reality. What it believes in, seems to be an educational *préparation* for religion; educational *religion* it is not. To the great question, Is there any room for religion itself, as related to children, to be educational? it answers practically, No. It is one thing to be tending a field in which seed has been sown, and to be looking with confident hope for the appearance of the blades of grain; it is another thing to be working in a field, not with the expectation of any present growth, but with the indefinite hope that at some future time the seed may be deposited there. It is one thing to be imparting religious instruction as a por-

tion of the nutriment by which the new nature of the baptized child is to grow and become strong; it is another thing to impart such instruction, that it may so influence the mind as to lead ultimately to the child's conversion. It is one thing to say to a child, "You are a Christian; you must hate and flee from sin, and be living, in your own way, as a Christian person ought to live;" it is another thing to say to him, "We are teaching, and laboring, and praying that you may some day become a Christian." It is one thing to say, "You are a child of God; you ought to be loving, and faithful, and obedient to your Heavenly Father;" it is another thing to make the same exhortations without being able to assure him at all that he is God's child. Such, without any misrepresentation, is, we think, the difference between the method of educational religion and that of the Sunday-school movement.

We would guard against being understood to say more than we intend. We are simply declaring that the Sunday-school movement, as apprehended by us, does not realize the idea of educational religion. Beyond this we are not pronouncing judgment upon it. We hope to be preserved from that fatal narrowness of spirit which would confine the Holy Spirit to a single method of operation, and deny the activity of God's grace where there is no formal recognition of its natural and necessary order. We thankfully acknowledge the vast amount of Christian truth which the system embraces and diligently teaches, as we have already conceded, also, the great moral earnestness and the sincere desire to do good, by which it is characterized. All this, however, may be truthfully granted, while yet it may appear that the basis upon which the movement grounds itself, and the method by which it proceeds in its training of the young, are not such as most truly correspond to the idea of the Christian religion, and such as the best results may be expected from. The present and immediate good which it accomplishes may be freely acknowledged, while there may still be room to fear what the indirect and ultimate results may be of a system so one-sided and so poorly corresponding to the true idea of Christianity. This, we think, is

the state of the case with the Sunday-school movement. If, as we think we have shown, religion is not only capable of being educational, but was meant to be so, and must needs assume this form in order fully to answer its own idea; and if a sound, symmetrical and reliable piety is best developed in such manner as we have described; then the Sunday-school movement cannot, in the nature of the case, fail to place itself on this ground without danger of confusion and error and spiritual detriment. That it does fail so to do, we have seen. This is its principal weakness, and, among all its perils, there is none equal to this.

In not recognizing the possibility and necessity of educational religion, the Sunday-school movement remains, after all, substantially one with the system which it criticises, and with which it would appear to have broken. It censures, as we have seen, the ignorance and incompetence with which, in former times, a certain portion of the Church was accustomed to deal with the religious wants of childhood; and its own theory and practice bear the appearance, at first, of being something different and far better. A candid examination, however, shows that, as to educational religion in the true sense, the system we are considering, agrees with that which it condemns, in the rejection of it. So far as we are able to see, the Sunday-school movement differs from the system over which it claims so much superiority, simply in this, that it recognizes the necessity of devoting more attention to the religious interests of childhood, and believes that, under the influence of religious training, *the conversion of the child may be expected sooner* than it was in former times looked for. In principle, there is no difference between the two. As to the Christian life, how it begins, and the means by which its development is promoted, they stand in perfect agreement. Of baptized children as being Christians, and of religious training as the process by which the new nature of the Christian child is to be developed, they both alike, know nothing.

When, therefore, we enumerate, as we now propose to do, several of the leading defects by which the Sunday-school

movement is hindered and crippled in its religious training of the young, we are at the same time pointing out some of the defects of that more general type of religion, in the bosom of which, notwithstanding a slight and incidental difference, it nevertheless stands.

1. This movement fails to make proper account of the age of childhood, as this exists in the bosom of the Christian Church. It does not know, and seize, and take advantage of, the extraordinary opportunities of this important age, for religious purposes. It will be deemed audacity to make this charge; for is not the movement accustomed to claim this very thing as its peculiar and distinguishing merit? Nevertheless, the accusation is just and true. The characteristic advantage of childhood, for religious purposes, lies not merely in its relative innocence and greater susceptibility, but in this, that, as it exists in the bosom of the Church, it carries in itself the possibility and beginning of a Christian life, the development of which, may, without any delay, be carried forward. Not to see this, and make practical account of it, is certainly to fall short of realizing the extent of childhood's advantages, in a religious point of view. What is needed, and to be expected, in the case of a Christian child, is, that, under proper nurture, such a child should be growing in grace and bringing forth the fruits of repentance, and faith and obedience; but, in the hands of this system, instead of being made to feel the immediate and present obligation he is under, of leading a holy life, he is simply being prepared, as well as may be, for such time as it may please God to give him His grace and make him a Christian. What a strange perversion is here; what a mistaking of the child's true position and actual relations; what a loss of time and opportunity; what a failure to make right account of the immense vantage-ground of Christian childhood! Out of its own mouth is the movement condemned, when it charges the Church with "not knowing the art of caring for Christian little children;" for it does not itself know this art, and it is ignorant of it, because it does not know that, to begin with, there are "Christian little children" to care for.

2. In basing itself as it does, the Sunday-school movement loses, to an alarming extent, that grasp upon childhood, which, in order to be truly successful, it ought to have. Any one who enters into the spirit of the New Testament Epistles, will perceive that their instructions, admonitions and exhortations derive their altogether peculiar power and force from the fact that those to whom they are addressed, are regarded and treated continually as being already, all of them, Christians. This is the tenor of all the apostolic exhortations: Ye are "in the Spirit," *live therefore in the Spirit*; ye are "dead unto sin," *let not sin, therefore, reign in your mortal body*; ye are children of God; *be ye therefore followers of Him as dear children*; "Ye were sometime darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord, *walk as children of light*;" Ye have received the grace of God, *see to it that your having received it be not in vain*. It is easy to see that the strength of the exhortation here lies in the fact of the grace already received. Now, these are the types of all Christian appeals and exhortations. What a powerful sweep and force the appeals of the Christian teacher possess, when there is upon the part of the taught, such a recognized and felt relation to the world of grace, as brings home to him the necessity of the holy obedience to which he is exhorted. But, where this is not the case, there these admonitions and appeals are shorn of almost all their strength; there the mighty leverage is wanting; there the strong grasp upon the heart and conscience of childhood is gone. And, that this is not the case with the Sunday-school movement, we have, alas, seen too plainly. Indeed, prior to the "conversion" which it aims at, there seems to be no room at all for the use of such apostolic exhortations; whereas, it needs their strong and powerful grasp for the very purpose of bringing that conversion about.

3. This movement, or the type of religion with which we have seen it to be identified, has indirectly done much to retard the cause of true religion, by making it a strange, foreign and repugnant thing to the young. Nothing is more thoroughly human than religion; and it is of the greatest importance for the progress of religion that this truly human character should

be preserved. But where it is denied that grace is capable of coming with earliest infancy, and of being, under proper nurture, the element in which, from the beginning, the child lives and moves, and has its being; where it is practically taught, that there is no possibility of being truly religious, until after the peculiar experiences of a conversion, indefinitely located as to time, but sharply defined as to character; there one inevitable consequence is that religion assumes, for the young, an unnatural, spectral and ghastly aspect. It becomes an unearthly thing of "protracted meetings" and "revivals," rather than of the daily life; and loses altogether that familiar and home-like character, which, according to its very nature, it ought to wear. One reason, unquestionably, why religion has so little hold upon the young, is the *un-human* guise in which it is made to confront them. And that it bears this character is one direct consequence of the method which this type of religion pursues with the young. The Sunday-school system, it is true, makes special efforts to make the young feel "at home with Jesus," but, alas, the difficulty lies in its very stand-point, and will not be removed till this is surmounted.

4. The movement is crippled by a want of thorough harmony with the Church. The Sunday-school can have no significance or power apart from the Church. This is, to some extent, felt by the movement itself. In opposition to a strong disposition to look upon the Sunday-school as "the child's Church," there are some who justly say, "This is a dangerous error, and one which we must frown down." Nevertheless, from its very nature, the system involves a tendency to regard itself as an independent work, and thus to stand, to its own great injury, in more or less disjunction from the church. Where the Church is felt to be the institution by which people, both old and young, are to be built up in the faith and hope of the Gospel, containing the sacraments and means of grace for that purpose; and where, on the other hand, the Sunday-school is carried on in the spirit of the S. S. movement, as represented by its Conventions; there will always be felt to exist a painful and embarrassing dualism, between the Sunday-school

and the Church. It is a trite saying, indeed, and one which has come to be accepted as true, without being at all looked into, that "the Sunday-school is the nursery of the Church." But we appeal to any pastor, whose church and Sunday-school stand in such relation as we have described, to know whether he has found this to be the case, in any such degree as the saying would seem to imply. This side of the movement, indeed, constitutes by itself an important and interesting theme, upon the discussion of which, however, we cannot enter now.

In what has been said, it will be perceived that we have chosen to take for granted, the baptized condition of the children of the Sunday-schools, notwithstanding the well known fact, that many of them are not baptized. This will give rise to an objection, to which it is necessary for us, before concluding, to reply. It will be objected, namely, that such a plan of educational religion as we have indirectly been advocating, is manifestly impracticable, seeing it supposes the baptism of those who are thus to be trained, while a large proportion of the Sunday-school children are unbaptized. To this we reply, that the argument is not affected by this fact. For, supposing this to be the real objection in the case, it would apply only to the unbaptized, and could not possibly extend to those who are baptized. We reply further, that the present unbaptized condition of many children, is a state of affairs which has itself grown out of the loss of faith in the reality of baptismal grace; and that, as such, it cannot be used as an argument, where the question is as to the truth and validity of a system of religion which grounds itself in that reality. The real objection to educational religion lies not here but elsewhere; and elsewhere we deem that it has been answered. The true difficulty is, not that the Sunday-Schools contain many unbaptized children, but the fact which is the cause of this, that there is no belief at all in the grace-conferring nature of baptism. Baptismal grace is that with which educational religion stands or falls; and, where this is denied, any attempt to realize the idea of such religion must be, in so far, but a "catching at the shadow of the truth."

ART. VII.—CONSCIENCE AND THE VATICAN.

An Address on the Origin of the Present Revolt in the Catholic Church, Delivered March 20th, 1872, in the Guerssenich Hall of Cologne by Prof. Reinkens.

TRANSLATED BY PROF. J. S. STAHR.

THE present reform movement in the Catholic Church touches the entire culture of humanity. For this reason it is possible to consider it from so many different points of observation. I shall endeavor to-day to prove that it originated in the conscience of individual Catholics. For our reform movement is nothing else than the effect of the voice of God raising itself *in man* against the voice of the tempter *from without*, who appears clothed as an angel of light; the war we wage is the war of conscience against compulsion in matters of religion.

The system of church polity adopted by the Roman Curia, which has now been developed to its extreme and most repulsive consequences, endeavored centuries ago to force itself upon the Christian nations under the shield of divine authority, and the result has been that now nearly one half of Christendom, *i. e.*, about one hundred and sixty-eight millions of Christians, are no longer in church communion with the Pope at Rome. But why have so many millions remained in external communion with him?—about one hundred and seventy millions, for the common estimate of two hundred millions is much too high; no one can obtain that number from reliable statistics.—Previous to July 18th, 1870, it was still possible for the individual to save his conscience, the Catholic could still respect himself. This, however, is not generally admitted. The advocates of infallibility maintain that even previous to that time, the individual believer had no right of conscience as opposed to the conscience of the entire episcopate; and as

they now make the Pope to be the Church, they also refer to him the general conscience of the episcopate, and find this just as natural as convenient. Some Protestants also tell us, that before July 18th, 1870, the conscience of Catholics had been already actually bound and silenced, inasmuch as the Pope had exercised the functions of universal bishop and infallible teacher since the Council of Trent without meeting with any persistent opposition.

I will first answer the latter objection. It is true, as in recent times the index-decretals and papal briefs against Hermes and Guenther found most willing and inexorable executors in the Archbishop of Geissel and the Prince-bishop Foerster, so also were the earlier papal constitutions against Bajus, Jansen, Quesnel and the Synod of Pistoja executed by the bishops without examination. Yes, as in the year 1864 the bishops in general made themselves pliant tools for the execution of the Church polity of the Roman Curia in the syllabus, by which not only the modern state, but also a peaceful condition of society on the basis of brotherly love, was condemned, and even destroyed so far as papal power reaches, so also the episcopate succeeded as early as in the last century in forcing upon the faithful the immoral bull *Unigenitus*, (published by Clement XI in 1713) as a moral norm, with the single exception of the Church of Utrecht, to which the Jesuits gave a bad name for this reason. This bull insinuates the doctrine (Nos. 91, 92) that the Catholic, if the hierarchy should endeavor by threatening a manifestly and flagrantly unjust excommunication to keep him from the discharge of his duty, and move him to betray and give up the truth, must yield to the threat, neglect the performance of duty and betray the truth. In this way undoubtedly faith and morality are torn from the conscience root and branch, and all truly pious and righteous life is destroyed in the Church. And thus it would seem, judging even from these few examples, that the objection to the effect that the conscience of Catholics had been bound and silenced previous to the 18th of July, 1870, was fully justified; but this is not the case.

All that the Pope had accomplished up to July 18th, 1870, amounted only to this: that by his power, with the assistance of the temporal rulers, he maintained his position as a judicatory from which there was no appeal, inasmuch as he at once set aside the appeals to a general council which were made from time to time. If any one who had been either attacked or condemned by the Roman Church appealed to an ecumenical council, the pope came with his punishments, the temporal princes helped to inflict them, and the injured individual was silenced.

Meanwhile no one recognized the Pope as a judicatory of last resort for three centuries and a half; such a judicatory was, therefore, not introduced by the apostles, and hence is not a divine institution. We know very accurately from history that the Council of Sardica (after 343) first established such a judicatory in the person of the Pope for pronouncing judgment in the hierarchy, but not as if it taught that such power was found in the regular succession of the Apostle Peter. The council rather made this arrangement because of its own absolute authority as representing the entire Church. The right was conferred for the sake of expediency, not recognized as previously at hand. After the patriarchate which was then the western, or the Roman Catholic Church, had become separated from the four eastern patriarchates and from the country which was the cradle of Christianity, *i. e.*, after the middle of the eleventh century, the Bishop of Rome in consequence of historical development, as the only patriarch of the Occident, constituted the supreme tribunal of the Western Church. Now the most was made of this, because there was no longer an Oriental Church to oppose it. The supreme judicial tribunal was used for the most general purposes of centralization. From this time forward, inasmuch as the popes, on the basis of forged documents which were produced on the grandest scale in the ninth and eleventh centuries, endeavored just as greedily as unscrupulously to obtain absolute control over that part of Christendom subject to them, they gradually drew by unwearied and long-continued efforts, all ecclesiastical

matters, discipline, ritual, and finally also doctrine into the domain of their judicial decisions, whilst at the same time they claimed supremacy over kings and emperors, with absolute authority, thus confounding temporal and spiritual matters to a point where all distinction ceases.

But when at last, in the early part of the fifteenth century the Roman popes had led the Western Church to the verge of a precipice; when the Roman Church was torn by internal dissensions into three parts, headed by three popes with their respective Curiae and colleges of cardinals, so that all occidental Christians without exception found themselves excommunicated by the anathemas of three popes crossing each other triangularly; then God raised up men who knew the history of the Church, and who possessed sufficient integrity of character to bring to light the image of the old Catholic Church from the writings of the Fathers, and to show it to those Christians who still had a sense for the freedom of the children of God, and for true piety. And it was through their exertions that the great councils of Constance and Basel were called. According to the old Catholic spirit these again placed the highest power in law and doctrine into the hands of the ecumenical councils, inasmuch as these actually represent the law and doctrine of the whole Church. The superiority of the council over the Pope was acknowledged by the latter himself as well as by the whole Western Church. But when the Roman Curia had again received a head, and had recovered from its fright, it appeared that it had learned nothing. Not only were all efforts at reform rendered abortive by the Roman court, but the corruption was even heightened, and the consequence was that the Western Church suffered a permanent division, the consequence was the Reformation of the sixteenth century, which occasioned still greater centralization on the part of the Roman Curia. Now the Pope succeeded for the first time, with the assistance of his self-constituted pretorian guard, the "Society of Jesus," and through the constant service of the blinded Catholic, as well as Protestant princes, to deprive the Western Catholics, who were still dependent on

him, of their ecclesiastical rights, and to domineer over them completely. Now for the first time after the Council of Trent the oath of allegiance which the Pope required from the bishops did its full work. Not a word did it say of their duties toward the faithful, only of numerous and heavy duties toward their "lord," as they henceforth were obliged to call the Bishop of Rome, who confirmed, that is *appointed* them. In behalf of the universal government, for henceforth the Pope acted practically as universal bishop without hindrance, the Roman Curia, as we know it at the present time, was now gradually organized, this gigantic machine, with its numerous boards and congregations, of which Christian antiquity knew nothing. Now a company of upstarts collected there, who commenced to consider all the nations outside of Italy as barbarians, and with unbounded pride pretended to be in communication with the Holy Spirit, in virtue of which they demanded blind obedience from all the faithful. Government, discipline, ritual, doctrine, everything was now brought in final decisions into judicial formulæ, and the unity and life of the Church were based on command and obedience, which in the end will destroy both.

But notwithstanding all this, the individual Catholic still had room for saving his conscience; for however submissively all were obliged to bow before the decisions of Rome if they wanted to enjoy the blessings of the Church and the rights of citizenship, no one was, after all, called upon to believe that the Roman decretals *were in themselves true and just*, no matter how strongly the court theologians maintained that they were so. Even a curialistic theologian like Hergenroether must admit in regard to the so-called doctrinal decisions of the Roman Pope published during the last centuries, that the bishops had accepted them "not because they had found them correct, but on account of the authority of the chair of St. Peter," or as we would say: *on account of the actual power of the popes*. But the well-informed believer could not be disturbed in his conscience even by this authority. For above it stood the impregnable authority of the Councils of Constance and Basel. The former had, during its fourth and fifth ses-

sions adopted resolutions of the most far-reaching consequence and significance, and which had never been lawfully revoked previous to July 18, 1870, and of course could not be revoked. In the fourth session it had taught and resolved, "that the general council properly assembled in the Holy Ghost, inasmuch as it represents the Catholic Church, has its power *immediately* from Christ" (not mediately, therefore, through the Pope, as the Jesuits teach) "and that every condition and every rank, even the Pope, is bound to obey it in all things pertaining to the faith, to the removal of schism, and to the reformation of the Church in head and members." In the fifth session it was resolved that the Pope was obliged thus to render obedience to every ecumenical council. The same council also refused to admit that the co-operation of the Pope was necessary to the validity of the Council; it deposed three popes, and elected a new one only after a long interval; and the claim of obedience proves precisely this, that the opposition of the Pope alone does not destroy the universality of the Council.

These resolutions were confirmed and repeated by the Council of Basel. They were made an imperial law for the whole German nation by the Diet of Mayence during the March of 1439. In the so called "Fuersten Concordaten," i. e., in five bulls of Pope Eugene IV, of February 5 and 7, 1447, this Pope accepts the above-mentioned decretals without reserve, and promises to keep them faithfully, particularly in the bull which commences: *Ad ea ex debito*. The German nation had made this the condition upon which it would recognize him as Pope, and really so recognized him. And this happened under Emperor Frederick III, who was unusually devoted to the Pope, and made other concessions to the Roman Curia for which he has been very much censured. Even this emperor did not yield the superiority of the council over the Pope, inasmuch as the council was the highest ecclesiastical authority, receiving its power immediately from Christ in the representation of the entire Church, and Eugene IV submitted, although he had eight years before held the Florentine Council, from which

already the advocates of infallibility wish to draw the doctrine of papal infallibility. On the 28th of March, 1447, the following Pope, Nicholas V, gave over to the wrath of Almighty God and of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, every one who would dare to resist the agreement which his predecessor had made with the German nation, an arrangement which he recommended to be kept inviolate. On the strength of this the German nation recognized him as the new pope at the Diet of Aschaffenburg, July 13, 1447, and in consequence the so-called Aschaffenburg Concordat was concluded at Vienna, February 17, 1448, the principal basis of which were the reform decretals of the Diet of Basel which particularly emphasize the superiority of the council over the Pope. In addition to this the same concordat guaranteed to the German nation the right of demanding a general council, and on such a demand the Pope was bound to issue a call. It is true that Rome often violated the concordat without venturing, however, to assert that it had no binding obligation upon the Curia, even if this was secretly believed; but the Germans, after their complaints had proved ineffective, inserted the concordat into the electoral compact, and since the time of Charles V, every new emperor was obliged to accept it as part of his oath. Later popes, however, as Clement VII and Julius III again recognized the legal relations founded on it. At the Council of Trent, it is true, the Jesuit General Lainez, in a speech which ridiculed the divine institution of the episcopate and the superiority of the council over the Pope partly founded on it, had represented the bishops as simple delegates of the lord of the Church in Rome, and had defended a proposition concerning the primacy of the Roman high priest, which was already very similar to the Vatican decretal of July 18, 1870. But this excited such indignation on the part of the still self-conscious episcopate, and such dignified and powerful words were spoken under the leadership of the Archbishop of Paris, that the Curia withdrew the proposition. Thus the Aschaffenburg concordat, based on the resolutions of the Councils of Constance and Basel, retained its full force for the Catholics of

Germany. Every one could, when he received violence from Rome, justify himself in his conscience by appealing to it, and to a future general council, or at least comfort himself with the thought of justification by such a council. That is, every one was at liberty, while he submitted to a papal decree, to deny the truth and justice of it before God, and before men, if in so doing he followed his own conviction and his conscience, no matter whether the Roman Curia disputed this right and meditated new punishment or not. However much the Pope might usurp, decide, command, condemn, curse or teach, and however much he might carry out, with the assistance of the Jesuits and the temporal princes previous to the 18th of July, 1870, the individual believer could still *save his conscience*. The Pope was not the final, determinative authority for his judgment and conscience; if he was obliged to submit externally and to retire before superior power, he was *not* compelled to *believe* that the contents of the papal decrees were *true* and *just*. The Pope might condemn an appeal to a general council as often as he pleased; the right of such an appeal had for centuries been guaranteed to the Catholic even by the popes themselves, and his conscience could feel satisfied. The actual power of the Pope was for him no proof of truth and justice. Even during the growth of papal power in the middle ages, this was still the opinion of the most respected, the best men in the Church. When the popes commenced to subjugate the bishops, and for a beginning hit upon the cunning expedient of declaring single bishoprics free from the metropolitan bond, and abbacies separate from their bishoprics and immediately subject to their own power, St. Bernard of Clairvaux in the twelfth century recognized in this proceeding an interference with the apostolic episcopal order, and addressed himself to Pope Eugene III as follows: "By such a practice you show indeed that you have the fullness of power, but not that you possess the fullness of justice in the same measure; you do this *because you can do it*, but whether you *should*, that is the question." And Bernard gives the answer: You should not. This was the interpretation allowed to every Catholic of the

Roman Catholic Church previous to the 18th of July, 1870. The power exercised by the Pope is not the measure of his justice; and still more, the so-called doctrinal decisions of the Pope *ex cathedra*, accompanied by anathemas, are never in the world the standard of eternal truth, which our conscience alone determines. Whoever submitted to a Roman decretal stood precisely in the same condition as a citizen of the state when he submits to the decision of the superior court; in the very act of submission he may conclude in his own mind that the decision is a flagrant act of injustice; if he has good reasons for it his conscience will allow it.

The Vatican, inspired by the Jesuits, has now completely changed the state of affairs. Since the 18th of July, 1870, no Roman Catholic is allowed to submit to papal decretals without thinking and saying at the same time that they are in themselves incapable of improvement, because they are in themselves true and just. As early as the 13th of September, 1868, the Pope maintained in his encyclical letter to all Protestants: "Ecclesiastical authority," by which he means himself, "must govern the convictions of the human reason (or regulate them as the Jesuits say), and guide the actions of men in private and public life;" and he thought it was the duty of the Protestants, on the occasion of the council in the Vatican, to submit their reason and their conscience. And he wished to secure the same submission of all Catholics for all future time by the declaration of infallibility, for which the destruction of the apostolical constitution of the Church by the erection of the tyrannical throne of a universal bishop, only opened the way. The proposition: I am infallible in matters of faith and morals, signifies in its application nothing else than: I define your thinking and control your will; or, I am the regulative norm for your reason and the law for your actions.

I wish now in the first place to call attention to the fact that we have to do here with an insipid and violent transfer of the constitution and fundamental idea of the Society of Jesus, to the whole Roman Catholic Church. Jesuitical papers,

shortly before the Vatican Council, made the strange demand of all Catholics with continually increasing boldness, that it was necessary to sacrifice to authority not only the will, but also the understanding (the famous *sacrificio dell' Intelletto*). Well-informed and pious Catholics were astonished. Such sentiments were regarded as the startling utterances of a madman. But this was only the demand found in the thirty-fifth section of the Statutes of the Society of Jesus (*Summarium constitutionum*, § 35). According to it the superior has not only to command that the subordinate should act thus or otherwise, but also that he should *think* or *judge* thus or otherwise; and it is accordingly the duty of the subordinate to obey, inasmuch as he (thus it is literally stated) "renounces every individual opinion and his own rational judgment, with a certain *blind obedience*." And then follows in section thirty-six the revolting comparison, that the believer is in reference to his superior like a corpse which can be turned in all directions or treated in any manner you please, or like a cane in the hands of an old man. The comparison is very lame, however, for the statutes to which we have referred after all demand a judgment and a conviction; they demand namely that the believer be convinced that through his superiors he is really guided by Divine Providence, and he is to judge, therefore, that their doctrines are in themselves true, and that the actions which they command are in themselves just, that is in accordance with the moral precepts of the Gospel. Let me give a few examples. The one, strange as it may sound, is a great favorite in the cloister. If the superior says to the subordinate: "Take this flower and plant it with the flower cup in the earth and the root above," the subordinate ought not only to execute the command without a murmur, but he must also think that thus it is rational. If the superior says: "Thus God intended it when He created the flower; it is a perversion, a departure from the laws of nature, that the plant carries its flower cup above," the subordinate must believe that this is true. Furthermore, if the superior commands something that is not permitted, that is according to the best knowledge of

the subordinate, forbidden by the laws of God and man, he must, nevertheless, judge and feel convinced that it is just. A Jesuit who teaches otherwise acts against both the letter and the spirit of the statute of his society.

This statute, therefore, has now, since July 18, 1870, been transferred to the whole Roman Catholic Church. In the modern church of infallibility every believer is said to stand in the same relation to the Pope as the Jesuit to his superior; that is he must not only externally submit to the decrees of the Roman chair and its boards as a supreme juridical tribunal; but he must also judge and be convinced *against* his individual knowledge and conscience that *these decrees are just and true*, that they are the *word and law of God*.

Against such an assumption the conscience of the individual Catholic revolts, and from this revolt of the moral and religious spirit in us, our present reform movement has come forth.

We were taught in our youth, we learned it by heart in the catechism: "The voice of conscience is the voice of God." What can claim greater authority over us than the voice of God? Bishop Krementz of Ermeland has lately said to the Curé Grunert at Insterburg: "The church is higher than the conscience." As he said this in order to make submission to the Vatican decree of infallibility plausible, he could only mean by the term "church" the *pope*, as is generally customary among the bishops at the present time. That would mean, therefore; The Pope is higher than conscience, his voice is higher than the voice of God. Our conscience has already driven our opponents to make assertions of this kind which afford a deep insight into their intellectual as well as moral condition. They despair of bringing their doctrines, which are absurd and directly opposed to the apostolic tradition, in harmony with our conscience (which they like to call private judgment,) and hence they profess to despise this voice of God in us, on the authority of a man who in boundless self-exaltation claims divine prerogatives, and whom they reverence as their lord and master with fear and trembling. But we solemnly declare in opposition to all this: There is nothing higher than conscience! And if an

angel should come from heaven, and try to force something upon us as true against the voice of our conscience, we would repel him and say: There is nothing higher than conscience. If any external authority is to prevail for us as divine, it must not suppress and smother the voice of God in us, but gain its assent; for whatever comes from God is not yes and no, but yes; not strife, but harmony. It is well known that the Son of God is called "The Word" in the Sacred Scriptures, or according to the Greek "the Logos." Now the fathers referred both the voice of God in us and external revelation back to the Logos and therefore they taught with common consent that there could be no contradiction between the gospel and conscience.

When therefore we hear the voice of conscience within us, we have a right to inquire who it is that ventures to contradict this voice. It is inseparable from man, and in the development of his rational nature it must become audible; it speaks without being called upon to do so, yea, against the will of him in whose breast it dwells; it commands, but submits to no dictation; it weighs and judges his words and deeds. And thus also it weighs and judges every word and law that comes from without, and tests it whether it be of God, tests it by the ideas of truth and justice. In this respect also no one can defy this voice unless he is prepared to become a hypocrite before God and man.

If now the Pope represents himself to us as the possessor of absolute divine authority over our thoughts and actions, and therefore demands of us that we should recognize his decisions *ex cathedra* as in themselves true and just, our conscience cannot remain silent. And it speaks loudly; and because it speaks we are assembled here to-day! The voice of our conscience can have for itself only that which is received in us and by us rationally and freely, not forced upon us by external compulsion. The mediation of the word and the law coming without, for our consciousness, in which knowledge and conscience meet each other, can be accomplished only through the activity of reason and freedom under the control of enlightening and strengthen-

ing grace. And this is the reason why Jesuitical papers, even before the council, endeavored to prepare us for the irrational decretals, by urging upon us that in order to be a good Catholic it was necessary to sacrifice not only the will, but also the reason. For this reason also, since Pius IX wishes to set up his infallible authority in opposition to our conscience, he demands the sacrifice of the individual reason and freedom. For if this sacrifice is made, the individual conscience no longer acts; instead of it we then hear nothing but the confusing cries of fanaticism.

I have said that our church movement has sprung from the opposition of our conscience to the Vatican decrees. Permit me now to throw a little more light upon this subject, or in other words, make it practically plain, and I entreat you all to call your own consciences to witness.

Let us first take an example whereby we can test the certainty of the voice of our conscience.

We read in the Scriptures that God had determined judgment upon Sodom and Gomorrah, and that Abraham interceded and received the promise that if there were even two righteous men in these cities they should be spared for the sake of these two. Christ has taught that the days of tribulation, which must needs come upon mankind, should be shortened for the elect's sake. I ask: Does not your conscience agree with this? The internal voice answers with joyful assent to the external word, Yes, this is the character of God. He is, in His very essence, goodness and mercy. But now take the opposite: the Pope teaches all through the middle ages, that he has the right, on account of one guilty person, or rather one whom he considers guilty—but who perhaps is not guilty—to jeopardize the salvation of millions of innocent Christians throughout an entire country by means of the interdict, by depriving them of all public worship, of the sacraments, of an honorable burial, in order to incite them to insurrection or violence against this one, or to punish him.—Does your conscience also say yes to this? (cries: No, No!)

I will also let your conscience pass judgment on what was done in the Vatican Council.

For a thousand years or more no Christian thought of believing that the Pope of Rome had received immediately from Christ authority to exercise common jurisdiction in any diocese of the whole world, that he is the universal shepherd who appoints and removes bishops, who possesses the fulness of power in himself, and only calls the bishops to take part in the same. Yes, Pope Gregory the Great, declared as late as the close of the 6th century, that the erection of a universal episcopate, even at Rome, would expose the whole church to the danger of destruction. But the papal constitution of July 18, 1870, proclaims the Pope of Rome universal shepherd, and quotes, as if for the purpose of proof, words of Gregory M., which in the mouth of that Pope mean precisely the contrary. Gregory M. says it is his honor that all the bishops should retain inviolate the honor which they have received immediately from Christ. Pius IX, in his constitution would make us believe that he said: If I am honored then are also the bishops honored, for their honor is contained in mine. The well informed, reflecting Catholic recognizes in this a falsification in favor of the destruction of the old apostolic church order. The injunction now is: "Do not reflect, do not read anything that will make you reflect; the Pope thinks FOR YOU and in him GOD HIMSELF thinks. But the voice of conscience in the true believer contradicts this, for it is not true. Or does your conscience assent to it? I say no! (Applause.)

Since violence is now done to the conscience, the honest Catholic must attach himself to the reform movement. And where do the bishops stand? They resist the voice of God, they resist the manifest truth, when they say: the Church, *i. e.* in their sense, the Pope, stands higher than conscience. Such an assertion is outrageous.

During the same period of time no one thought of believing that the Pope could, even provisionally, give doctrinal decisions for the whole church. We were taught in our youth to consider it a Protestant slander that Catholics were obliged to be-

lieve that the Pope was infallible. The Irish bishops, in order to obtain political equality, made an official oath that such doctrine did not belong to the faith of the Catholic Church. On the 13th of July, 1870, eighty-eight bishops, the representatives of Catholics among the enlightened nations, one of whom represented more believers than fifty bishops of the former States of the Church, solemnly testified before the assembled council, that according to their belief the doctrine of Papal infallibility was not contained in the word of God. The newly elected Popes of Christian antiquity affirmed that they honored the decrees of general councils like the Gospel, in order to receive the recognition and church communion of the other bishops, so also did they not pretend to make doctrinal decisions as if by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, but endeavored to justify their faith by Scripture and tradition, considering the activity of the Holy Ghost as general in the Church, where it could be discerned in the emperor, in the individual theologian as well as in the synod. We know that Popes have erred in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity concerning the trinity, the person of the Redeemer, grace, &c., that three ecumenical synods condemned Pope Honorius as a "heretic," and that for centuries the Popes swore to the justice of this condemnation. And after all this we are to be thrown out of the Church by the Papal decretal of July 18, 1870, if we are not convinced that God has revealed and Christendom always believed that the infallibility of the Church is in the exclusive possession of the Pope of Rome, and that therefore his decisions in matters of faith and morals "are perfect in themselves, and not because the Church agrees with them." Our conscience, because it is a Catholic conscience, cannot give its assent to this perversion of the Divine word. (Applause.)

In order to enable us to recognize in the Catholic Church the divine word from tradition, we had a peculiar, definite norm—a *principle* of tradition. Protestants objected to our position by saying that even if tradition contained any Christian doctrines beyond what is contained in the Bible we would not be able to recognize and prove such doctrine with any degree of

certainly. We were taught to answer this objection by saying: We possess a sure criterion for this. If, for example, it cannot be proved that any given doctrine is of post-apostolic origin, and nothing in opposition to it is found in the faith of the Church, but on the other hand, going back as far as we please, the universal faith of Christendom in all ages and countries testifies in favor of such doctrine, then we can explain its presence in such general form, only by referring it to apostolic origin, or to apostolic preaching. In this sense, therefore, the winged word of Vincent of Lerins: *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, has not only obtained the most general recognition in the Catholic Church for almost fifteen hundred years as the most convenient expression of the norm of tradition, but the council of Trent has given it a more explicit form by saying that the doctrine of tradition "had come to us from hand to hand in uninterrupted succession through all generations." But when in 1870 the bishops of the opposition in the Vatican Council, who spoke for a majority of the Christians represented there, having still respect for their conscience and their honor, applied this criterion of tradition to the doctrine of infallibility, whose origin demonstrably belongs to the latter part of the middle ages,—when bishop Hefele, with his book concerning Honorius, had driven the leading Cardinals into a corner, and the latter did not conceal their embarrassment from the Pope, and when one of the bishops remarked to the Pope that he could not disregard tradition, then Pius IX., spoke the surprising words: "I am tradition!" (Laughter.)

This word, destructive at once of the norm of tradition and thereby also of the principle of the Catholic Church itself, the genuineness of which no one has as yet questioned, became the basis of the action of the majority in the Vatican Council at its final session, and of the minority after their flight in their submission at home. Pope and bishops have promulgated in official documents the principle which does violence to the whole course of history: "Because the Pope declares anything a doctrine in faith or morals, therefore it is the contents of tradition." Hitherto the Catholic principle has always been:

"Because something is contained in tradition, and is so recognized, therefore it may be pronounced the word of God by general councils, and established as a dogma." Pope and bishops have thus with despotic violence completely reversed the principle of tradition, and thereby destroyed it.

Can our conscience assent to this? Is it pride now, that we have started a movement of Church reform in opposition to that revolution from above, that we oppose and resist until death that violent, forced construction of the norm of Catholic tradition? Is it pride or conscience? No, pride, self-exaltation, the carnal spirit, external power, material possession, money and riches,—all these things are on the side of our opponents; but on our side is CONSCIENCE and THE TRUTH. (Long continued applause.)

The Council of Trent commands Catholics to interpret the Sacred Scriptures only according to the interpretation of the fathers, *i. e.*, in the continual sense of tradition. But every sensible man will readily admit that, in order to do this properly, we must not overleap the first six centuries, which are evidently the most important for the traditional understanding of the Scriptures. This is, in fact, the proper "period of the fathers" in the church terminology. Well, Luke xxii. 32, we find a passage in which Christ addresses Peter: "But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and, when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." Peter had just expressed, on the day before the Lord's suffering, his bold self-confidence; the Saviour now kindly foretold him his fall, but promised him also his conversion, for which He had prayed; and, as an offering of thanks in return, He requested that Peter should afterward strengthen his brethren in the faith. There was no thought here of doctrinal decisions, of an office, or of a successor. When Peter continued in his self-confidence, the Lord plainly foretold him his threefold denial. This is the context of the passage. The fathers of that period often had occasion to interpret this passage, and not a single one of them ever thought of finding in it a reference to the preservation of the faith in its purity, or to a ministerial function, as successor

to the Apostle Peter at Rome, or to a successor of Peter at all, in the most general sense. And rightly so. The apostles were not only apostles, called and sent for the founding of the church, in the name of Jesus, but, like all other men, they also had need of personal salvation, and for this reason the Saviour sympathized with them; and the passage under consideration treats of the personal salvation of Peter, who denied his Lord with an oath before a maid-servant. But the Roman Curia, in the Vatican decree of July 18, 1870, has employed this passage as the only one to prove (in opposition to the unanimous interpretation of the fathers), that Pius IX. has the divine right to declare himself infallible; that Scripture passage, we are told, contains the promise that Pius IX., for example, can infallibly decide whether the body of man has natural life in itself, or whether it consists of dead matter (as in Guenther's case), or that he expresses the Word of God when he condemns the fundamental laws of Austria as horrible, and declares them null and void! In this way the rule of Scripture interpretation, which the Tridentine Council has made normative for the church, is set aside, and another main pillar of Catholicism is overthrown. Our conscience resists this mode of procedure, and, therefore, we are among the opposition!

I have just read the latest work of Bishop Ketteler of Mayence ("Die Centrumsfraction auf dem ersten deutschen Reichstage.") In the preface he complains that, in the German diet, one is in a certain sense *spiritually bound* "not only by the necessarily strict order of business, but still more so for the sake of the other members who have the same right of speech"—a kind of passive condition, which prevents one from saying many things one would like to say on a given question, or to justify a particular vote. But if this be so, to what extent must the Baron of Ketteler have felt himself "*spiritually bound*" in the Vatican council, where every exertion should have been made to bring forward *the whole testimony* of Christendom concerning the faith, and of which he now asserts, with all those who have "submitted," that it was free! Let us briefly recall a few incidents.

When the council was called, the subjects that were to engage its attention were intentionally kept secret; and yet these were subjects on which, according to the Catholic principle, the testimony of the whole church should have been collected. Hence, the bishops appeared in Rome unable to give the full testimony of their dioceses, because they had not inquired concerning it. The episcopate was entirely passive in constituting the council, and hence it became not an organism, but a mechanism. An order of business was forced upon it which necessarily impaired its freedom. The pope tyrannically retained the free right of making motions for himself alone; so also the final right of definition. Thus, we find, according to the official documents, that on the 18th of July, 1870, not the council but the pope spoke. The proceedings could not be generally understood, on account of the audience-chamber and the language; the stenographic reports were kept from the bishops — a difficulty which Baron von Ketteler did not even encounter in the German diet. In Rome, the bishops were under police supervision; tours of recreation they were not allowed to make. Bishop Hefele was not permitted to have his book on *Honorius* printed in Rome; he had to turn to Naples; and yet Herr von Ketteler could have a private declaration printed in Berlin; he could even distribute it among the deputies in the diet. Bishops, whose independent testimony was received with particular ill-favor, because of their dependence upon the Roman Curia in other respects, were disciplined and bitterly reproached by the pope, who took no personal part in the labors of the council, but acted behind the curtains, representing to them even that they held the office of bishop by his favor. The journalists, often of doubtful reputation, who, in falsified reports, shamelessly abused the bishops of the opposition, before the mass of people who were incapable of forming a judgment, were praised by the pope in official briefs. A second order of business destroyed the last vestige of freedom. The bishops of the opposition came praying with petitions to the pope as to a father, but were despised, as unprofitable servants. Finally, things came to such a pass, that these felt

something of manliness within them, and, on the 8th of May, 1870, they made a memorable protest to the proceedings. In this protest, they consider it incompatible with their dignity as bishops, their official position in the council, the rights which pertain to them as members of the council, to present petitions which, as their past experience has more than sufficiently taught them, are not only not granted, but not even answered. They consider the mode of procedure adopted by the presidents of the council as in the highest degree dangerous to the church and the apostolic see, they wish to guard against having part in the responsibility for the unhappy consequences before men and the frightful judgments of God, which must necessarily follow, and they desire that their written protest shall be an imperishable document of all this. But they were disregarded also with this protest. Then came the arbitrary conclusion of the debate, *i. e.*, a great part of the church was prevented from giving its testimony; the 13th of July came, which fixed the dissent (the non-agreement of the church) for all future times—a subsequent “submission” to the pope cannot annul this—the 17th and 18th of July came, with the following acts of violence. Was all this freedom or compulsion? What does your conscience say?

The problem which the council was to solve was a great one, if it had understood the times; for many centuries there were abuses in the church which needed to be rectified, but the rectification did not come. We are, at the present moment, in such a condition that every reflecting person must be horror-stricken when he sees the abyss toward which we are tending. An infamous moral principle has become prevalent among the younger clergy, the moral principle of the Jesuits, of the so-called “probability.” The younger clergy have been led so far that they cleave to the letter, distinguish church commands which have not been given by the Church but by the hierarchy, place ecclesiastical commands on an equality with divine commandments, ascribe to them the same binding force and immutability as to the eternal commandments of God, which are made known by the voice of God in the conscience, and in the

revelation of the Gospel. Here was an abundance of room for reformation. This Jesuitical moral causes mischief which is spread by means of the confessional, and which no one knows unless he has, like myself, sat for years in the confessional, and has seen how the conscience of the people has been disordered by it. Here there would have been great problems for a general council. Legends and fables run through the whole ritual; we celebrate the Saints' days of saints who never lived; legends have crept into the service of the mass, and the breviary of the clergy swarms with fables. Here was material enough on which a general council might have expended its labor. Archbishop Darboy, whom the Commune afterwards shot—one of the most cultivated and learned prelates in the Vatican council—wrote to the pope, and adjured him most solemnly to act magnanimously; to do the great deeds which the times demanded; to give them the reconciliation of faith and reason, of authority and freedom, of church and state.

And what has happened? The bishops were in session seven months, and what have they done? In two sessions they accomplished nothing, except doing unworthy reverence to the pope, a reverence which dishonors the bishop, if he knows that he himself is the successor of the apostles; in the third session they published a decretal concerning faith, which is entirely superfluous, unless it should have some meaning in a few ambiguous sentences; and, finally, the principal thing: "THEY HAVE INFALLIBLY DECLARED THROUGH THE COUNCIL THAT THE COUNCIL IS NOT INFALLIBLE." And we are now expected to believe the infallible utterances of a council that is not infallible. Many bishops struggled against it; one wrote, in his opinion, that would be suicide; a second said it was something unheard of; a third said: I will sooner die than accept such a thing. But the one has committed suicide, the second has heard it, and the third has not died. (Laughter.)

Let me only tell you briefly what this means, that the pope demands the sacrifice of our reason, that he wishes to determine our thinking, guide our acting, that he wishes to be our reason and our will. Every well-informed citizen knows that the

welfare of states rests on knowledge and labor; knowledge in order to discern the proper ends to be sought after, and the means which lead thither; and labor, in order to reach these ends; and, under the influence of knowledge and labor, the powers of man unfold their most beautiful blossoms. But, if we sacrifice our reason and our freedom, how shall we acquire knowledge, and how shall we labor? We have a problem before us in the church, which we can also solve only by means of knowledge and labor; reason and freedom, under the control of grace, led by the voice of conscience; these are the talents which we have received from God, to trade with, and to bring to our Lord, as a result, the fruits of truth and righteousness. Reason and freedom are the manifestation of the image of God in our souls. The image of God has no significance at all, if it does not mean that we are exalted into a similitude to God. But, in order that this may be so, we must receive the light of the Divine Word, and the law of God, which is the law of conscience. Shall I now destroy the image of God in its manifestation, by saying: "The pope is my will, and he thinks for me?" How can I, in this case, solve my moral problem before God? The image in me demands that with my spirit I penetrate into the original beauty of God, in order that I may transform the natural man into the heavenly man, who is created in righteousness, in holiness, and truth. But I can do this only when I live in the spirit and not in the letter. For the word of God is spirit and life.

All authority which we are to receive as divine must rest upon our conscience; and it can do this only by means of the solid pillars of truth and justice. If the hierarchy itself breaks these pillars, if it wishes to dazzle our reason, and take away our freedom, then the consequence is that our conscience no longer serves as the foundation of such authority, and then authority itself sinks into the ground. Our conscience also demands eternal authority to guide us into the divine likeness; but this authority is no man of fear and terror, who holds in one hand the thunderbolt of excommunication from church and state, and in the other the match to the faggot. Once only

the voice of God sounded out of resplendent glory: "This is my Son; hear Him!" When Christ taught, some said, "Our heart burnt within us, as he opened the Scriptures;" or, "He speaks as one having authority," and a woman for joy over his doctrine, called His mother blessed; thus His word penetrated to the heart, thus it harmonized with conscience. Men were not pointed to the only teacher of humanity in a moment when He appeared terrible, but in the hour of bliss. For when He was transfigured on the mountain, floating in sunny splendor before the eyes of the chosen disciples, when Elias appeared at His side as a sign that truth was no longer declared in images, but had appeared in person; and Moses on the other side as a sign that the law of fear had become powerless, and had been resolved into the law of love; when Christ shone so gloriously in the light of truth that Peter, quite enraptured, forgetting every thing else, cried out: "It is good for us to be here, let us build three tabernacles," and, for joy, thought not of himself: then it was that the Father, His Father and our Father called out of His resplendent glory: "Hear Him."

Yes, with this kind of authority, coming from without, we find the internal voice of God in sweetest harmony. He whom we shall hear as the Teacher of Truth, is the God of our conscience. Truth flows from His mouth like light, and the law of love writes upon the tablet of our hearts: "Him will we hear!"

ART. VIII.—REGENERATION AND CONVERSION.

BY REV. WM. RUPP, A. M., BERLIN, PA.

THE order of salvation, or the subjective process by which the objective grace of Christ is appropriated, and salvation actualized in the individual man, includes a number of successive stages which are more or less distinct from each other. Among these Regeneration and Conversion are generally regarded as occupying a central, and, therefore, most important, place, though there is much difference of opinion in regard to the nature and significance of each, and in regard to the relation which they sustain to each other. Some would place conversion before regeneration; but we propose to discuss them in the order in which they are mentioned above, believing that the result will justify the adoption of this arrangement.

The presupposition of salvation is sin. Salvation is deliverance from sin and its consequences. Hence a correct understanding of the process of salvation presupposes a correct understanding of the nature and extent of sin. A Pelagian theory of sin, for example, leads necessarily to a false or defective theory of salvation. If the universality of sin were a consequence only of imitation; if it were true that individual men are now born without sin, and that they become sinners only when they begin to commit sin in thought, word and deed, which they learn to do simply by seeing others do the same; then salvation would evidently need to be nothing more than a process of outward reformation or improvement. The teaching of moral philosophy would then be as effective a means for the salvation of the world as the preaching of the gospel, and Socrates might be as good a Saviour as Christ. This, indeed, is the notion of many at the present time. They imagine that the power of sin may be broken, the reign of moral as well as

physical evil abolished, and a golden age made to dawn upon the world, simply by mental and moral culture, by the dissipation of ignorance and superstition, by the education of the masses, by the cultivation and development of human nature as it is. Hence the world is full of novel schemes for the improvement of humanity—schemes that make no account of the Gospel, of Christ, the Church, the ministry and sacraments. Instead of the Church we have societies; instead of the ministry, masters and grand masters; instead of sacraments, regalia and passwords; instead of regeneration, pledges; instead of conversion, enlightenment; instead of sanctification, improvement. But unfortunately the depth and breath of the evil which is to be thus removed, are not understood; and the result, therefore, is always an aggravation of it rather than an amelioration.

Scripture and experience teach a very different theory of sin from that which underlies and conditions all these superficial notions of salvation. Sin is not contracted and propagated simply by education; neither can it be removed by education. Sin does not consist merely in a wrong way of thinking, feeling and volition, that we fall into somehow when we come to self-consciousness. Its beginning or root lies back of all self-consciousness, in the substance of our life itself. Our catechism teaches that we are "by *nature* prone to hate God and our neighbor," and hence *unable* to do that which God demands of us in His law. We do not become sinners only when we begin actually to transgress this law; on the contrary, we are sinners before we transgress, and we transgress *because* we are sinners. The proneness, tendency, impulse or bent to commit sin is in our nature from the very beginning of our individual existence; and the actual commission of sin, therefore, is but the legitimate outworking of what was in our nature, or in the substance of our life, before. The oak-tree does not become such only when it begins to produce acorns. It is an oak-tree from the earliest moment of its existence, because, though it has not yet borne acorns, it nevertheless possesses the nature and essential qualities of the oak; and there-

fore its fruit can never be anything else than acrid acorns. And thus it is with human nature. This is perverted, disordered, depraved, corrupt in its deepest ground, and therefore nothing good can come out of it.

And this corruption or depravity of human nature is the consequence of the fall and disobedience of our first parents, Adam and Eve, in Paradise. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, inasmuch as ($\epsilon\varphi'$ φ') all have sinned," Rom. v. 12. "By the fall and disobedience of our first parents," says the Catechism, "our nature," that is not simply the nature of the individual, but our *generic human nature*, which lies back of the individual, and from which the individual proceeds in the way of generation, "has become so corrupt that we are all conceived and born in sin." Adam was not simply the federal, but the organic head of his race. His life, while it was individual, was at the same time also generic, bearing in itself the possibility of all the numberless individuals that have ever been, and that may yet be, born; in the same way that the acorn involves in itself the possibility of a developed tree, and of a whole forest of trees that may proceed from it. The character of Adam's life, therefore, determined the character of the life of his posterity. Adam's descendants, accordingly, have become sinners, not simply by the imputation of his guilt and the consequent withholding from them of original righteousness, nor by the imitation merely of his example, but by having proceeded out of the substance of his life both in respect of body and soul. We cannot enter here into the old dispute between Creationism and Traducianism; but we assume that the latter theory is in so far correct, that the human soul, as well as the body, is begotten, not in such sense, of course, that it could be said to be a *part* or offshoot (*tradux*) of the souls of the parents, by which these would be so much diminished, but nevertheless a *product* of the parental life, and not an original creation; for we believe that the doctrine of hereditary sin, so clearly taught in the Bible, is consistent only with some such theory as this. If an illustration be needed, we would refer to

the manner in which Adam's own life is said originally to have proceeded from God. God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and thus he became a living soul. That life-breath, in our opinion, can not be regarded otherwise than as an emanation from the being of God; and yet it could not be said to be a *part* of God, in such sense that God's being would now be so much less than it was before. In the same way, no doubt, the soul of the child is an emanation from the souls of the parents, and receives its characteristic qualities and fundamental determinations from them. The act of generation involves, therefore, both soul and body. That which is generated, or begotten, is not body only, nor soul only, nor body and soul as separate entities to be joined together afterwards in the process of growth or development, but soul and body as comprehended germinally in the power and principle of one life. In its origin, in the *punctum saliens*, human life is one undivided power, containing in itself the possibility or germ both of soul and body, and these are actualized subsequently in the way of evolution or development. But here already is sin too, as a disordering, disorganizing, disintegrating force, and hence the whole process of development is abnormal. This abnormal character shows itself to some extent already in infancy, as no careful observer can fail to perceive, and becomes continually more manifest in proportion as the individual grows older. All the faculties and powers both of soul and body, as soon as they manifest themselves in the way of action, are found to be disordered. The will is perverted, and bent upon evil rather than good; the understanding is darkened; the desires and passions are wild and ungovernable; the feelings are troubled and painful; and the body carries within itself the seeds of dissolution and death.

The evil lies, therefore, in the depths of our nature, at the very centre and root of our spiritual, psychical and physical life; and here also the remedy must begin. We can easily see that no merely outward reformation or improvement, no merely mental or moral culture, however complete and thorough it might be, would avail here. "The leprosy lies deep within,"

in the essence of our being, in that substantial ground from which all the faculties and powers of body and soul proceed ; and, therefore, no process of salvation could be effective, that does not reach to this depth. A thorn-bush is not changed into a fig-tree by the pruning and trimming of its branches. The thorns might, indeed, be cut off and the bush made smooth ; but in spite of this, its inward nature and life would remain the same as before, and the next year the thorns would grow out again, and the bush would become as horrid a thing as ever. So no sinner can be changed into a saint, no child of wrath converted into a child of God, by simply outward processes and appliances. What is needed here is a *Regeneration* or new spiritual birth. And it is plain too that this must be something more than that simply subjective change of heart or mind, which is so often made to pass for regeneration.

It is well known how much confusion reigns in the popular religious literature of the day, in sermons, tracts, Sunday-school books and religious journals, in regard to the meaning of the terms regeneration and conversion. By many they are wholly identified and used as convertible terms. Thus people are told continually and indiscriminately that they must be regenerated or converted ; and this then is often explained to mean simply that men must experience a change of mind or heart, which they can do whenever they resolve to try. The change, in this view, is only a subjective process, involving merely the *way* of thinking, feeling and willing in regard to religion and divine things, which men are expected somehow to bring about themselves. The change is supposed to reach, not the faculties or organs of the soul themselves, much less the life in which these faculties are grounded, but only the way or form of their action. Instead of delighting in sin, men are to delight in righteousness ; instead of loving the world, they are to love God ; instead of groping in darkness and error, they are to know the truth ; instead of willing that which is wrong, they are to will that which is good ; but all this without any change in their nature, in which their feeling, intelligence and will are grounded, and by which the activity of these is determined and

conditioned. But this is not regeneration. Such a process as this involves no mystery. A change of this kind Nicodemus could have understood well enough. Take a drunkard in one of his sober moments and reason with him. Tell him of the pernicious consequences of his vice. Remind him of the ruin which he is bringing upon himself and upon all who are dependent upon him. Arouse his feeling of self-respect, and make him to be ashamed of his past conduct. Paint to his imagination the loveliness and beauty of a sober and decent life. In this way you may cause him to become disgusted with his vice, and influence him to make up his mind that he will henceforth be a sober man. Here there is a moral change, but there is no mystery in it—except the mystery of rhetoric. It is a mental and moral process that is intelligible enough to the common understanding. And any other example would serve the purpose of illustration as well. Suppose a person who is indifferent to religion and unconcerned about his eternal destiny. Talk to him about the necessity of salvation. Describe to him the glory and blessedness of heaven, and paint to his fancy the horrors and torments of hell. He may thus perhaps be reasoned or persuaded into a change of mind. His thoughts, feelings, desires and purposes may be revolutionized; but this, whatever else it may be, is not regeneration. If our Lord had not meant something vastly more than this when He said, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God," there would have been no reason certainly why Nicodemus should have been so much perplexed by His words.

Regeneration is a change produced by the Holy Spirit, not primarily in the sphere of consciousness, but in the substantial centre or ground of the human constitution itself. It is the production of a new life in the substance of the old. This is implied by the etymological signification of the word. Regeneration is the counterpart of generation. The latter is the process by which a human being is originated, consisting of soul and body, or according to the trichotomical view, which has its truth too, of *spirit*, soul and body, with definite qualities and determinations. Regeneration, on the other hand, is the pro-

cess by which in this human being a new life is begotten, which, starting in the spirit, is destined in the way of development to renovate and transform the entire being. The expression "new birth," though often used in the same sense, is therefore, in its literal signification, not entirely equivalent to the term regeneration. They differ in the same proportion as the terms *generation* and *birth*. The term generation is more comprehensive than the term birth. Generation denotes the production or origination of a being of the same kind as that by which and in which it is originated; while birth is but the transition of this being from one stage of existence to another. The former term may be used sometimes so as to include the idea of the latter, but the latter is never used properly in the sense of the former. The Greek word for *birth* is *γενέ* or *γενεή*, as in John ix. 1, and the idea of *being born* is expressed by the verb *τίτω* in the passive form, as in Matt. i. 23, Luke i. 31 and John xvi. 21. The more general idea of generation is expressed by *γέννησις*, from the verb *γενῆναι*, the proper signification of which is to *beget*, to *engender*, to *produce*. In the New Testament, indeed, this latter verb is not seldom used in such an extended signification as to include the idea of *being born* or *brought forth*, as in John viii. 41, and also John ix. 2 and 34; but the passages are few in which the latter idea is the exclusive, or even the predominant, signification. *Γεννηθῆναι* then signifies to *be begotten*, or to *be generated*. And this is the word used, either in connection with other modifying words, or in connection with the preposition *ἀνά*, to express the verbal idea of regeneration. The former usage is that which prevails in the writings of St. John. So in the Gospel, iii. 3: "Except one be begotten from above (*μή τις γεννηθῇ ἀνωθεν*) he cannot see the kingdom of God; which idea (of being begotten from above) is then, verse 5, further defined by the addition of "water and Spirit." In the first epistle the same idea is expressed by the phrase *γεννηθῆναι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ*; as, for example, "whosoever is begotten (*γεννημένος*) of God does not commit sin." Compare also iv. 7, vi. 1, 4 and 18. St. Peter uses the compound verb *ἀναγεννηθῆναι*. So in the first Epistle, i. 3, *ἀναγεννήσας*,

where our translators have rendered correctly "begotten;" and verse 23 of the same chapter, ἀναγεννημένοι, where the English version reads "born again," though there is no reason why it should not have been rendered by the same word as in the *third* verse. From this verb was formed afterwards, in ecclesiastical Greek, the noun ἀναγέννησις, which, however, does not occur in the New Testament. St. Paul once uses the analogous noun παλιγγενεσία (washing of regeneration, Tit. iii. 5), which is the literal equivalent of the Latin-English word *regeneration*. The same word is also used in Matt. xix. 28, where however it denotes the resurrection and glorification of the last day, implying that the final glorification of the saints, and the consequent glorification of the world too, are but the full efflorescence of the process begun in regeneration.

Regeneration, accordingly, is the production or origination of a *principle* of new life in the substantial core of human personality. The agent by which this is accomplished is the Holy Ghost. Man can not regenerate himself, as he can change his mind, his feelings, views and purposes. His regeneration can be as little the product of his own activity, as his carnal conception and birth, or his natural generation. In the act by which a new life is begotten within him the subject is required to be wholly passive, or at least purely receptive. He can not contribute anything towards the change, either by his own operation or co-operation, but can only quietly and silently suffer it to be wrought within him. Anything like *synergism* in the work of regeneration is entirely out of the question. Hence also it is required of adults, Matt. xviii. 3, that they become as little children in order to enter into the kingdom of heaven; which kingdom, according to John iii. 5, can only be entered by being begotten of water and Spirit. "Except ye be converted (στραπεῖτε) and become as little children," says our Lord here to adults, "ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." In the case of a little child, sin though present as a perverting force, is still in the minimum of its energy. It is a slumbering power, that has not yet attained sufficient strength to resist the impression of divine grace, or interpose a bar in

the way of its operation. Hence the little child, though a sinful being, and as such not actually in the kingdom of heaven, is nevertheless susceptible to the regenerating, quickening influence of the Holy Spirit, and capable of thus entering into that kingdom. No previous mental and moral preparation is necessary, as in the case of adults, to fit the child for the reception of the grace of regeneration. To suppose the contrary would be to make the grace of Christ less comprehensive in its operations than sin, while we are told by St. Paul that "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." This could not be true, certainly, if the whole infant world were shut out from regenerating grace, as all sorts of Baptists, and some too who are not Baptists, would have us believe. An infinitely better and worthier view of the scope of Christ's grace is that expressed by Irenæus in the often quoted passage: "He came to save all through Himself—all, I say, who through Him are born again to God—infants, and children, and boys, and youths, and old men. He therefore passed through every age, becoming an infant for infants, thus sanctifying infants; a child for children, thus sanctifying those who are of this age, being at the same time made to them an example of piety, righteousness and submission; a youth for youths, becoming an example to youths, and thus sanctifying them for the Lord." The unconscious passivity of the age of infancy, therefore, instead of being an obstacle in the way of regenerating grace, is in fact the very best condition for the reception of that grace, and hence the adult must, by an act of self-negation, reduce himself to the passive state of a child, in order that he may be able to receive the same, and so enter into the kingdom of heaven. For the adult sin is no longer merely a slumbering power; on the contrary, it has become a developed force. It has taken possession of the will, the affections and thoughts, and has given them all a perverse bent or bias. The *habit* of the whole personality has become fixed in a sinful form; and this fixed habit presents a barrier to the work of regenerating grace, which must be broken down and taken out of the way, before this grace can become operative. An abnormally or sinfully developed per-

sonality is no longer passive, like the child, over against the influence of regenerating grace. But it must become so again in order that this grace may be able to accomplish its work within it. In this sense the adult must again become as a child in order to regeneration and entrance into the kingdom of heaven. We can think of no better illustration of the condition required here than the spiritual state of the Virgin Mary, when she answered to the salutation of the angel: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to Thy word." Mary's will in no sense co-operated in the production of the mystery within her womb; but we can easily see how, if it had been adverse, it might have prevented the mystery so far as her person was concerned. Her state was one of receptive passivity, and that was the condition required in order that the Holy Ghost might come upon her, and that the power of the Highest might overshadow her. And a similar state of passivity is required now in order to the production of the mystery of regeneration in the individual soul. This seems to be what St. John means when he says of Christ, that "as many as *received* Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born (or *begotten*, *γεννηθῆσαν*), not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." No adult sinner, however, could bring himself into this state of receptive passivity simply by the exertion of his own will. There is necessary, in order that he may be able to do this, what in the theology of Augustine is called *prevenient*, in distinction from *operative* or regenerating, grace; which may be defined, in a general way, as the activity of the Spirit of the Father drawing to the Son.

But while the Holy Ghost is the agent in the work of regeneration, as above said, He is not the originator of that new life which He therein communicates to the human soul. He does not create it *de nihilo* just before planting it in the soul. The Spirit is not the *author*, but the *giver* of life; and the life which He gives is that of Christ, the exalted and glorified God-man. Christ is the sole fountain of spiritual life for the whole human race. It is scarcely necessary to quote texts in proof

of this proposition. All those passages, however, would be in point here, in which Christ is called, or calls Himself, *the life*, *the bread of life*, *the resurrection* and *the life*, *the way*, *the truth*, and *the life*, which are numerous, especially in the Gospel of St. John. The same thought is implied also by the contrast in which St. Paul places Christ to Adam, 1 Cor. xv. 22 and 45. "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." "And so it is written, The first Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a *quickening spirit*." Christ is the Second or Last Adam. The first Adam is the source of life for the race physically and psychically. Men are derived from Adam, *the man*, in the way of natural generation; and for this reason also they are all sinners; since "that which is born of the flesh," or derived from a stock whose life is corrupt and weak, "is flesh," that is, corrupt and weak also, and can never of itself become anything else. Christ, on the other hand, is the source of life for the race spiritually. He was made a quickening Spirit. In this respect, as in others, the race is reheaded in Him. He stands in the same relation to it spiritually, at least in so far as it is regenerated and saved, that Adam stands to it naturally. As by natural generation men become partakers of the natural, sinful life of Adam, so by regeneration they become partakers of the spiritually glorified life of Christ; as by natural generation they become partakers of *human* nature, so by regeneration they "become partakers of the *divine* nature," 2 Pet. i. 4, which does not mean simply a moral resemblance, an ideal communion, but a real communion of being with God in Christ. This is not Pantheism, or if it is, it is St. Peter that is guilty of it. It does not mean, however, that any part of Christ's *individual* or *personal* being is by regeneration infused into His people, in such way that His own being would be diminished by the process. We have already seen that the derivation of man's life from God in the beginning, or the derivation of the child's life from that of the parent, requires no such conception. God did not breathe a part of Himself into man's nostrils, in order to make him a living soul; although what He did breathe into him was an

emanation from Himself, and not a created element. So no part of the parent's individual personal being passes over into the child, and yet the child as to its whole constitution is a product of the parents' life. In like manner the life of regeneration is an emanation, by the Holy Ghost, from Christ's divine-human-life, and yet no sensible or material part of His personal being. As an illustration of this relation between Christ and His regenerate people, we may refer to the influence of the sun upon the life of vegetation on our planet; bearing in mind, however, the old adage, *omne simile claudicat*. It is well known that the green color of plants, for example, is produced by the influence of the sun's light. If a plant be caused to germinate and grow in a dark place, it will be pale and sickly; but the moment it is removed into the light, its color will begin to change and the whole plant will seem to be endowed with new life. The sun exists at a vast distance from the earth: and yet from it, and in connection with its rays, there goes out a mysterious power or influence, which lodges itself in the plant's life and imparts to it new qualities, a new tone and character; and yet in this process the sun loses no particle or atom of its own matter. The process is purely dynamical. And so now there goes out from Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, a new spiritual principle of life, which lodges itself in the centre of the human soul, imparting to it a new character, breaking the power of sin and producing new qualities and attributes within it. This is regeneration. We must observe, however, that the new life thus lodged in man is not to be regarded as holding in separation from Christ after it has come to exist in the human soul. On the contrary it forms a perpetual bond of union between Christ and the soul; so that the soul is in Christ as the branch is in the vine, or as the members of the human body are in the body. "Ye in me, and I in you"—that expresses the relation subsisting between Christ and His people from the moment of their actual regeneration. The *unio mystica*, according to Reformed Theology, is not first formed by means of the Eucharist, nor does it begin in conversion or during the

process of sanctification; but it is to be regarded as the direct and immediate concomitant of regeneration.

The objective medium or instrumental cause of regeneration, according to Scripture and the ancient faith of the Church, is the Sacrament of Baptism. When our Lord first speaks of regeneration to Nicodemus, He connects it with water and Spirit. And St. Paul's "washing of regeneration," (Tit. iii. 5,) is by the Heidelberg Catechism and the great majority of commentators considered as identical with baptism. That regeneration is once ascribed to the *Gospel*, as in 1 Cor. iv. 15, and several times to the *Word* ("word of truth," James i. 18, and "word of God," 1, Pet. i. 23), can easily be harmonized with the common doctrine of the Church, when we bear in mind the peculiar sense in which these terms are used in the New Testament. By *word* we commonly understand merely the *name* of a thing, as a sound of the voice, or the expression of an idea, which we regard as an abstraction only of the mind. But the Hebrew דבר and the Greek λόγος denote *the objective matter or thing itself*, as any one will see who will take the trouble to consult Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon. Hence the term *word* in the New Testament sometimes denotes Christ Himself, and sometimes the substantial realities of that world of grace and truth which proceeds from Christ as its centre and ground, and which forms the objective contents of the Gospel, as well as the inward substance and life of the Church. Even the most common view of baptism makes it to be the rite of initiation into the Church, which would not be a bad definition of the sacrament, provided we bear in mind always the true nature of the Church. The Church, says St. Paul, is the body of Christ, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. If we make earnest of this thought, as we are bound to do, and do not destroy all its force by unscriptural and unwarranted distinctions of *visible* and *invisible* churches, then to become a member of the Church is at the same time to become a member of Christ and partaker of His life; for Christ's life is by the Holy Ghost infused into the Church, and that is just what makes it to be a living organism or body. The grace of regeneration, therefore, does

not come immediately and directly from heaven ; as the Baptist preachers of Boston must imagine, who *resolved* lately that baptism consists in the immersion in water of a *regenerate* believer. It comes from heaven indeed, from Christ, the exalted Head of the Church, but it comes through the Church and holds within the Church. Men are not regenerated by the Holy Spirit on the outside of the Church, and then brought into it for preservation ; but they are regenerated by being incorporated with, or ingrafted into, the Church through the sacrament of baptism, which was ordained as an organ of the Church for this purpose. As the human body by means of organs adapted for the purpose, lays hold of materials belonging to a lower order of existence, receives them into itself, and then assimilates them to itself as parts of its own constitution by communicating to them its own qualities and properties ; so the Church by means of its organs lays hold upon the world of sinful humanity, takes this up into itself, as far as it suffers itself to be thus taken up, and regenerates and sanctifies it by communicating to it the supernatural life which is at hand in its own bosom. For this reason, no doubt, the new birth is connected inseparably with an entrance in the Kingdom of God. The Scriptural idea of the Church may not be identical in all regards with the idea of the kingdom of God ; and yet so much is certain, that in as far as this kingdom exists in the world at all, it exists only in the bosom of the Church ; and hence no one can be in the former without being in the latter. The entrance into it, however, is by regeneration, or by being begotten from above, that is, by the power of a life reaching down from this supernatural kingdom itself through the ordinance of baptism consisting of water and Spirit. As by natural generation we come to have an existence in the world of nature, by whose forces and powers we are continually surrounded ; so by regeneration we come to have an existence in the kingdom of grace, and are thenceforth surrounded by, and brought into contact with, the powers of the heavenly world ; or as St. Paul says, "blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ."

The immediate effect of regeneration is *justification*. Justification does not consist in the infusion of a foreign righteousness, in the sense of the Romish Church, which identifies it with sanctification; nor is it merely a *forensic* act of imputation, in the sense of modern Puritanism. It consists in the imputation of Christ's righteousness, but *on the ground* of that vital union with Christ, which is formed in regeneration. We can not think of regeneration and justification as being separate in time. As soon as the sinner comes to be a member of Christ, and partaker of His life, the Father views him no longer as he is in consequence of his natural birth and relation to Adam, but as he is in consequence of his relation to Christ. Christ's righteousness covers, in the sight of the Father, the sins of His members. In Christ, the only begotten Son, the Father has declared Himself to be forever well pleased; and that good pleasure of the Father extends not only to Christ the Head, but also to His members. We may define justification, therefore, as that act of God the Father, whereby He accounts us as just for the sake of Christ's merits, and on the ground of our vital union with Christ. We thus preserve the truth underlying the forensic theory, for he who is justified still knows himself to be personally without *merit*; and at the same time also the truth underlying the Romish theory, for justification is not a mere fiction in the mind of God.

The indispensable subjective condition of justification, however, is *faith*. According to the whole New Testament, but especially St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, the sinner is justified by grace through faith in Jesus Christ. Even the objective vital union with Christ, or, which is the same thing, Christ's indwelling in the soul, is said to hold, on the subjective side, in the element or bond of faith. Christ Himself says, John vi. 47, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that *believeth* on me, hath everlasting life." St. Paul says, Gal. ii. 20, "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh *I live by the faith of the Son of God*;" and for the Ephesians he prays, iii. 17, "that Christ may

dwell in their hearts *by faith*." But if justification, and by implication regeneration also, are thus conditioned by faith, how then can the unconscious infant be regenerated and justified? This, as all know, is a question that spoils much of our theology at this point. The Baptist has a short and easy answer. Assuming that the infant is incapable of faith, he holds that it ought not to be baptized. And many who are not willing to adopt the Baptist's conclusion, nevertheless adopt his assumption, generally without examining it, and thereby involve themselves in difficulties and inconsistencies on every hand. Thus a difference is often made between what, it is supposed, baptism may accomplish in the case of believing adults, and what it may accomplish in the case of unconscious infants; so that for adults the sacrament would be one thing, and for infants another. True the Scriptures make no such difference. St. Paul says to the Galatians: For as *many* of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." In the previous sentence he says: "Ye are all the children of God through faith in Christ Jesus." And he connects the two sentences by the causal conjunction "for," thus showing that he regards their sonship through faith as the effect of their having put on Christ by baptism. But what we wish to call attention to especially is the universality of the statement, *as many of you*. There is no limitation, distinction, or qualification. So also in Romans vi. 3, "Know ye not, that so *many* of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into His death?" But a certain class of commentators will tell us that the persons baptized in the apostolic age were generally adults, who received baptism at their own request and desire, and who were at once able to exercise the act of conscious faith, in whose case the sacrament, of course, secured the grace of regeneration; but that afterwards, when infant baptism became the rule and adult baptism the exception, the case was changed. The sacrament, according to this view, was at first designed only for adults, and in their case it answered its purpose very well; but afterwards, when infant baptism became general, as it did immediately after the age of the apostles, as

soon as the Church was established and Christian families secured, it was found to be no longer applicable in the same form and character as before, and had to be so modified as to make it a sign only of the grace of regeneration, to be communicated subsequently in some other way. The sacrament, then, has degenerated since the time of the apostles, and has now no longer the same efficacy and force that it had then. If this notion were correct, then we could not expect to learn from the New Testament what baptism is *now*, but only what it was long ago, and there would be at least one subject in reference to which the Bible would no longer be a sufficient rule of faith. Now we grant, of course, that the first subjects of baptism were adults; but we hold, nevertheless, that it was the will of Christ from the beginning that infant baptism should become the rule in the Church, that baptism is a sacrament especially for infants. Circumcision was administered to Abraham when he was ninety years old and nine, but his descendants were commanded to be circumcised on the eighth day. We believe, therefore, that infant baptism is the normal practice, corresponding to the mind and will of the Lord, and that it confers upon the infant now no less than it ever conferred upon any adult baptized in the apostolic age. At any rate, the grace conferred in either case is the same in *principle*. There is, therefore, no difference between adult baptism and infant baptism; on the contrary every baptism is *essentially* infant baptism, for the adult even must become as a little child in order rightly to receive it.

But if this be true, then the assumption upon which the Baptists' rejection of infant baptism and this notion of a modification of baptism are based, must be given up as false. Can an unconscious infant then have faith? The old Reformed theologians, from Calvin downwards, answered this question in the *affirmative*. For quotations see Ebrard's Dogmatics, § 455. The tendency now is strong to answer it in the *negative*. And the only argument in favor of this view commonly is the question, *How* can an unconscious infant believe? To which it might perhaps be enough to reply, "There are more things in

heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamed of in your philosophy." Does not our Lord, in Matt. xviii. 6, attribute faith to little children? We know the passage is commonly made to refer to such big children as Peter and the rest of the apostles then were; but let any one read it once without the pre-supposition that little children are not *capable* of faith, and see whether it will not also yield another and a profounder sense. The disciples came to Jesus saying, Who is the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven? And He called a little child (*Παιδίον*) unto Him, and placed it in the midst of them; and then after telling them that they must be converted and become as little children in order to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, He continued, "Whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven. And whoso shall receive one such little child, (not simply an adult who has humbled himself and become *as* a child, but a literal child like that which stood in the midst of the disciples at the time) in my name, receiveth me. But whoso shall offend one of *these little ones that believe in me*, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck," etc. "These little ones that believe in me"—who would ever have supposed this, in the connection in which it stands, to refer to others than children in the literal sense, if it were not for the difficulty of understanding *how* they can believe? But even that may be owing to our present defective philosophy of faith, rather than to any particular difficulty in the thing itself.

Let it be borne in mind that the question here is concerning *justifying* faith, which is not a product of nature but of grace, being wrought in the heart by the Holy Ghost, and in this sense a gift of God. Justifying faith, therefore, is not before regeneration and in order to regeneration, but the effect of regeneration, the activity of a regenerate soul. Such faith is a *direct* sense and apprehension of the supernatural and divine or of Christ, and is possible only in consequence of an immediate union of subject and object; as the sense of vision is possible only in consequence of an immediate union of the eye with its object, light. Faith, accordingly, is not knowledge,

or a product of reflection ; on the contrary, it precedes knowledge and is in order to reflection. If faith were merely a determination of the intellectual faculty, a conviction, or conscious holding for truth, after full inquiry and examination of that which God has revealed to us in His written Word, then of course the infant would not be capable of it, so long as its consciousness is undeveloped. But faith is an activity of the *heart*. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." And the heart, in the Scriptural sense, as all know, is the centre of the whole human constitution, the focus from which all the energies and faculties of the soul diverge, and to which they again converge, that which we commonly call personality. But the essence or substance of this is not consciousness, reflection or thought, but *will*, which is at first a simple energy or force, involving in itself, however, the possibility of conscious volition and thought, as the seed involves the possibility of the plant with its leaves and flowers. The essence of man, say the profoundest modern psychologists, is not *thought* but *will*. In its natural state, however, the will, thus forming the root or essence of personality, has a tendency which is averse to God and His law ; and that is sin. This tendency exists previously to the development of consciousness ; for the will is never undetermined or indifferent in reference to good and evil ; else it would be a mere force of nature. In reference to the highest interest of its being the will of the child is determined before it determines itself. Its will has a tendency towards evil before it knows what evil is, a tendency which it has not given itself, but which, as we have just said, exists previously to the development of consciousness. And certainly this tendency can also be changed by divine grace previously to the development of consciousness. As the roots of a plant in a dry soil spontaneously turn in the direction of moisture, or as the tendrils of the vine reach towards and fasten themselves upon a supporting object, so may and must the unconscious will, or heart, of the infant, which is abnormal and uncomfortable in its isolation or separation from God, turn towards Christ and fasten itself upon Him whenever He is

brought into felt contact with it by the operation of the Holy Ghost.

But such an immediate *sense* and *apprehension* of Christ as this implies, is nothing other than the essence of justifying faith. Why should this be supposed to be impossible before the development of consciousness? Is it not antecedent to consciousness or reflection even in the adult? The knowledge or reflective certitude of the relation which comes to exist between the soul and Christ by means of the soul's direct act apprehending Christ, is of course impossible without consciousness; but not for that reason the act of apprehension and the relation itself, as this must in all cases precede such knowledge or certitude. Must I not be one with Christ before I can know myself to be one with Him? Must I not believe in Christ before I can know that I believe in Him? Plainly the knowledge here can not precede the *sense* of union with Christ, but must follow it as effect follows cause. We are directly related to the natural world by means of natural sense. Sense brings us into immediate contact, or in felt relation, to the world; and this is the indispensable condition of all conscious perception and of all reflective knowledge of the world. Sense precedes knowledge. We see and hear before we know that we do so, and before we know what seeing or hearing is. Sensation awakens reflection, not reflection sensation. And so now we are directly related to the supernatural world, or to God in Christ, by *faith*. Faith discloses to us the supernatural, as sense discloses the natural world. Here faith is the indispensable condition of knowledge. We believe in order that we may know, not the reverse. This does not mean, of course, that knowledge may not react upon faith, and thus serve to intensify and strengthen it; as science also reacts upon sensation and teaches us how to use our senses to the best advantage; but it does mean that the genesis of faith must be antecedent to the genesis of knowledge. And why then should it be supposed, especially in the case of the infant, that the capacity for faith must be measured by the capacity for knowledge? If this supposition were correct, then our own faith would stop

whenever our knowledge stops. In the unconsciousness of sleep or of disease, the believer would no longer be a believer, and then Christ would cease to dwell in his heart. Faith as to its essence is an *actus directus* of the soul, whereby this lays hold of and fixes itself upon Christ, and which, therefore, is what it is whether we know it or not. And we are justified by *faith*, by that *actus directus*, and not by our *knowledge* of faith, or by that *actus reflexus*, by which we know and are certain that we do believe. And now of that *actus directus* we hold that the regenerate infant is capable no less than the adult. For a fuller discussion of this subject we refer to *Delitzsch's Biblical Psychology*, v. § 4, where the same conclusion is reached that we have come to here.

It will be understood, of course, that we do not ignore or undervalue the benefit flowing to the child from the faith of its Christian parents. That the faith of parents may become a medium of blessing to their children we can see from many examples in the New Testament. To the woman of Canaan, whose daughter was grievously vexed with a devil, and who, though not a descendant of Abraham, nevertheless addressed the Lord by His Messianic title and besought Him to help her, He answered at last, "O woman, great is *thy* faith; be it unto thee as thou wilt. And her *daughter* was made whole from that very hour." To that father who brought his demoniac son, first to the disciples, and then to Jesus, and cried out in an agony bordering on despair, "If Thou canst do anything, have compassion on us, and help us," Jesus replied, "If *thou canst believe*, all things are possible unto them that believe." And then, when the father cried out again and said with tears, "Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief," Jesus rebuked the foul spirit, and it came out of the son. In these and similar cases the faith of parents became the bridge, so to speak, for the passing over of the healing power of Christ into the persons of their children. And in the case of the Centurion of Capernaum we see how the faith of the master resulted, in the same way, to the benefit of his servant. To him also the Lord said, "Go thy way; and as *thou* hast believed, so be it

unto thee. And his *servant* was healed in the self-same hour." And so now the faith of Christian parents forms in some sense a medium for the communication of the grace of regeneration to their children in the sacrament of baptism; and hence the Church can only baptize infants on condition that they have Christian parents, or sponsors who desire baptism for them. But this parental faith cannot be justifying faith for the child. It is related to this somewhat as prevenient grace is related to regenerating grace, serving to prepare the child for the reception of the latter; but with the reception of this latter, that is, with the reception of a principle of new life, we hold that it receives also the capacity for faith. At any rate there must be at once such an inward conjunction of that new life with the child's incipient personality, as implies an immediate and spontaneous sense and apprehension of the former by the latter. Some, indeed, may not choose to call this faith; but whatever it be called, we are convinced that it is identical with faith in its fundamental essence, and that it is the root from which *conscious* faith subsequently grows forth.

In the act of regeneration, according to what has now been said, the child is delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of Christ, Col. i. 13-20. It now belongs to Christ; it is a member of Christ, and stands in a direct, immediate or felt relation to Christ and His kingdom. Of this relation, however, it is at first *unconscious*. As the tendril is unconscious of the object around which it has twined, or as the infant is unconscious of the mother at whose breast it is nourished, so the regenerate child is, in the first moment at least, unconscious of Christ upon whom its soul has become inwardly fixed. A time, however, arrives when it must become conscious of this relation and of all that it involves, a time when by an act of self-determination it must take up the relation into its subjective life or into the processes of its mind, and when it must freely choose to abide in it and live in conformity to it. This change or transition of the life of grace from the objective essence or nature of personality into the sphere of consciousness or mind we denominate *Conversion*.

The noun *conversion* (ἐπιστροφή) occurs only once in the

New Testament, namely, Acts xv. 3, where, however, it is used as a general term to denote the transition of persons from heathenism to Christianity. The verb (*ἐπιστρέφω*) in its various forms is used nine times, but not always in the same sense. Our Lord uses it several times to denote the mental and moral process through which adult Jews, whose life and character were contrary to the true spirit of Judaism, must pass in order to be able to enter into the kingdom of heaven. One of the passages in which the word is thus used, we have already examined. St. Peter uses it in the same sense, in Acts iii. 19, where he exhorts the murderous Jews, who had killed the "Prince of life," if not directly, at least indirectly, so that they were all guilty of the great crime, to repent and be *converted*, in order that their sins might be blotted out. In James v. 19, it denotes the recovering or return of a Christian who has erred from the truth—the coming back of an apostate. But in none of the senses in which the word is used in the New Testament can conversion be regarded as a universal requirement in order to salvation. Nathanael, an Israelite in whom there was no guile, and John, who no sooner saw the Lord than he followed Him, needed not to be converted like those hostile Jews who had consented to, or taken part in Christ's crucifixion. Polycarp who served Christ eighty and six years and never erred from the truth, and Baxter who knew no time when he did not love the Lord, needed no conversion like the apostate heretics referred to by St. James. And persons baptized in infancy and growing up in the communion of the Church can need no conversion like the Gentiles. And yet it would sound strange now to hear it said that salvation is possible, in the case of any adult, or that any one can be a true Christian, without conversion. In the modern theological sense of the term, which is, however, not precisely the Scriptural sense, conversion is still a universal requirement in order to salvation.

In the Heidelberg Catechism (Ques. 88,) the term conversion is used as the equivalent of the Scriptural term *repentance*, (*μετάνοια*), and defined as "the mortification of the old, and the quickening of the new man." So also in the Augsburg

Confession (Art. xii.) where the two parts of repentance or conversion are said to be contrition and faith. And this has now come to be the sense in which the term conversion is most generally used. *Μετνοια* is literally a *change of mind*. It is a subjective process—a conscious and voluntary operation of the mind itself. Hence men are *commanded* to repent. It is not a process in which men are simply passive, as in regeneration. In the New Testament men are never exhorted to regenerate themselves, while they are continually exhorted to repent. This is something which they must do themselves, and which they also can do, although not without the assistance of divine grace. Conversion or repentance, accordingly, in the Scriptural sense of the latter term, is an activity of the mind by which this consciously and voluntarily places itself into right relation to God and divine things—an activity by which the mind renounces the enmity against God, which is of the flesh, and puts itself into subjection to the law of God.

If it be asked why such an act is necessary in the case of a regenerate person, the essential core of whose personality is already fixed upon Christ, and pervaded more or less by the power of Christ's life, or "by the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus;" we may answer that salvation, while it is the work of God, must, at the same time, be also a work of human freedom. No man is saved against his will. To the commencement of the work of grace within him he can, indeed, not contribute anything. Here grace alone is operative. But afterwards, a moment must arrive when he is bound to co-operate with this grace, in order that it may reach its proper end. Adam was created in righteousness and true holiness. His will was in a right state or condition. We cannot conceive of will as mere force, without any moral determination. Such will would not differ from a mere force of nature; from the force of gravity, for example, or the spontaneity of the brute; in fact, it would not be will. Here probably is the truth underlying the dogma of a *donum supernaturale* in the case of Adam. His will, or moral faculty, was not indifferent to good and evil—not in a state of utter indetermination or indecision

—not a mere power of self-determination. Only the dogma must be regarded as false in as far as it regards the supernatural gift, the positive determination of the will, as something brought in or superadded subsequently to the creation, and therefore not belonging to the proper being of man; as though God had, at first, for awhile left him without it, in order to see what he would make of himself, and then, when He found that the poor creature could not make anything, come to his assistance with the supernatural gift. Adam in the first moment of his creation was endowed with the power of will, in a state of positive determination in reference to the good, or to God and His law. And yet that will, which was substantially good from the beginning, was required to determine *itself* also in reference to God's will or law, and thus to be good by its own choice. What Adam was substantially from the beginning, that he was required subsequently to make himself by a conscious act of his own freedom; which, however, he failed to do, not through want of ability, or because God, for a wise purpose, deprived him again of his original righteousness, but "through the instigation of the devil and his own *wilful* disobedience." So now, in the case of the regenerate person, a time must come when he is required to make himself, by his own free act, what he already is by divine grace; a time when he must become conscious of his deliverance from the power of the devil, of his own gracious relation to God and His kingdom, and of God's holy law, and when he must consciously and freely resolve to abide in that relation and to live in obedience to that law. He can only do that, of course, in consequence of that regenerating grace, which has already principally broken the power of sin within him, and delivered him from its bondage; or, as St. Paul says: "freed him from the law of sin and death," and thus restored to him the full and free use of his own will. And when he has done it, then we say he is *converted*. In the case of persons baptized as adults, this subjective act of conversion may coincide in time with the objective act of regeneration. But, in the case of infants, the two acts must necessarily be more or less separated in time; and this is the normal

order, unless infant baptism is an unwarranted innovation contrary to the will of the Lord; and it is with the normal order of salvation, as it holds in the Church, that we have now to do, and not with any possible exceptions to it.

The Heidelberg Catechism is evidently constructed after the idea of this order. The Catechism is not a book designed for the children of Pagans and Baptists, but for the children of the Church. The baptized child of the Church is at once recognized as a child of God, and as belonging to Christ. The Catechism does not begin, as some suppose it ought, by telling the child what it must do in order to become a Christian, and in order to obtain the forgiveness of sin, and deliverance from the power of the devil. The child is a Christian. It belongs not to itself but to Christ, with body and soul, both in life and in death. It has been delivered from the power of the devil, and is now not a child of wrath, but of grace. But now it is to become conscious of all this. It is to learn to understand what it all means. Here it finds itself existing in an order of grace, surrounded by gracious powers and influences, into which it has come in a way unknown to itself, and at a time of which it remembers nothing. But now it is to be taught how this has come to pass, and how much it means. "How many things are necessary for thee to know, that thou in this comfort mayest live and die happy? Answer: Three things—First, the greatness of my sin and misery. Second, how I am (not *may be*, which is a false translation of the German *werde*) redeemed from all my sins and misery. Third, how I am to be thankful to God for such redemption." In other words: The Christian child is now to become conscious of that kingdom of evil from which it has been delivered, and of the negative relation in which it has thus been brought to stand to it; and of that kingdom of grace in which it has its present being, and whose blessings and benefits it is now enjoying; and, finally, of the attitude or bearing which it must assume in reference to both, in order that it may continue to enjoy the comfort which is now its own. It is now by an exercise of its own mind and will to renounce, and turn away from, sin and the devil, on the one hand,

which is *penitence*, or repentance in the narrower sense; and, on the other hand, it is to turn unto God in Christ, to confess Him, to accept and own Him, together with all His benefits, which is conscious or developed *faith*. And these two together, namely, penitence and faith, in their interaction, form the essence of conversion.

We may compare the genesis of conversion to the genesis of the natural consciousness. By its natural generation and birth the infant comes to exist in the bosom of the world of nature. There exists at once a reciprocal relation between its own physical being and the forces and powers of nature by which it is surrounded. These act upon it and impress it; they nourish it and minister to its growth and development. And this they can do only because there is something akin, an inward correspondence between the life of man and the life of nature. But the child knows nothing of this relation. The light shines into its eyes, sounds strike its ears, objects touch its body, it sees, hears and feels, but it does not distinguish between the objects of its sensations and these sensations themselves, and therefore has no perceptions. It stands in a felt relation to the world, and has a sense of the world, but it has no consciousness of it. But this condition can not last always. The child's mind is growing. Its consciousness is developing in contact with the physical, mental and moral world by which it is surrounded. Gradually it begins to distinguish between itself and the objects of its sensations, and thus it begins to have perceptions. It becomes conscious of the world as an order of things distinct from itself, but to which it must now place itself in a free, self-chosen relation. Its previous passive, or merely felt, relation must give place to an active or conscious relation. It must penetrate the world by reflection; it must learn to distinguish between that which is beneficial and that which is hurtful, and it must by its voluntary activity appropriate the former and abstain from the latter. So now with the genesis of the Christian consciousness, or with the process of conversion. The Christian child exists in a world of grace. There is an inward felt relation between its own spiritual being

and the forces and powers of this world of grace, which impress it through the constitution of the Christian family and especially through the ordinances of the Church. But at first this relation is *only* felt. The child has no knowledge of it. If, however, it be brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, according to the Apostle's injunction, the child will gradually become conscious of it. It will become conscious of God in Christ—which is something different from the *general* consciousness of God, as the heathen have this too. It will become conscious of the kingdom of God, but at the same time also of a kingdom which is the opposite of this, namely the kingdom of Satan; for the former exists in the midst of the latter and is everywhere surrounded by it; just as in the regenerate person itself the "new man" exists still within the "old." And between these two now, namely between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan, the child is compelled to make a voluntary choice, although as to its inward being it already stands in the bosom of the former. It must by its own free decision make itself what it already is in consequence of God's objective grace. Its direct or spontaneous faith, the inward rapport between its soul and Christ, must become self-conscious or intelligent faith; it must come to *know* that it believes and what it believes. And so on the other hand, the negative relation in which it has thus far stood to sin unconsciously, must now be taken up into its consciousness. It must learn to know sin as something both hurtful to itself and displeasing to God, and indeed as something hurtful to itself *because* displeasing to God. Hence also it must come to hate sin and turn from it with all the energy of its soul. And finding that, although now justified and in favor with God, sin nevertheless has an existence still in the periphery of its own nature, that it is therefore still a sinful being, and in thought, word and deed continually offends, it must now be filled with penitence or sincere and godly sorrow. Penitence, however, must bloom into confession of sin and renunciation of the flesh, the world and the devil; while faith, on the other hand, must bloom into a confession of Christ, or into a profession of the articles

of our Catholic, undoubted Christian Faith. And here now the Church meets the subject with *confirmation*, in which he on his part renews and ratifies the promise and vow made in his baptism; whilst the Church, in God's stead, claims him publicly for the service of God, blesses him in the name, and confirms him in the covenant of God, invoking upon him in larger measure the Holy Ghost, by whose help alone he may be able to fulfill his vows by leading a holy and obedient life.

The Heidelberg Catechism makes no distinction between conversion and sanctification, as is commonly done in modern Theological works. It uses the term sanctification as a designation for the entire process or order of salvation, or for the whole work of the Spirit in the appropriation of the grace of Christ to the individual soul through the Church. Conversion then it regards as a process reaching from the moment of regeneration forward to the end of the Christian's life on earth; and this process, as we have already seen, it defines to be "the mortification of the old, and the quickening of the new man." The expression old and new man is derived from St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians and Colossians. In regeneration the personality is centrally and principally renewed, but the law of sin still exists in the periphery of its nature, so that the appetites, desires, inclinations and passions are still more or less under its dominion. This is that "law of sin in the members," warring against the law of the spiritually renewed mind, or against the "law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," which has become the determining principle of the mind. Here there is a conflict. The old and the new are contrary to each other. But the old is to be more and more absorbed by the new, or converted into the new, in such way however that it loses its own properties and qualities and puts on those of the new. The parable of the leaven may be taken to illustrate this process. The leaven is hid in the meal. But the mass of the meal, for some time afterwards, is apparently the same as before. The leaven is *hid* within it. It does not at once manifest it self to the observation of the senses. At a certain point, however, it exists; and there a

process of fermentation begins, which continues, ever enlarging the sphere of its operation, until the whole lump is leavened. So in the act of regeneration a principle of new and spiritual life is lodged, or *hidden*, in the centre of human personality, which is destined to penetrate and leaven the whole lump of human nature, and to eradicate and destroy all that is corrupt and sinful therein. Thus the new must grow at the expense of the old, until the old has been wholly abolished and the new has become all in all. The Catechism calls this entire process conversion or repentance. We may, however, distinguish two stages within it, according as it is either spontaneous or voluntary. At first, and for a considerable time afterwards, the process is undoubtedly spontaneous, for we can not conceive of the new life as at any time wholly inactive. But it can not always remain spontaneous, for the reason that man is essentially a free creature and is not saved against his will. It must, therefore, at length be taken up into the consciousness of the mind and become a voluntary process. And now, up to and including, the point where the process becomes voluntary, we call it *conversion*; from this point forward *sanctification*. The two determinations of the mind, namely penitence and conscious faith, reached in conversion, are however continued and become the principal subjective factors in the process of sanctification; and in this respect conversion and sanctification are one and the same process. We, therefore, define conversion as the transition of the life of grace into the sphere of mind or consciousness, forming here penitence and conscious faith; and sanctification as the transition of the life of grace, through penitence and faith, into the sphere of the affections, desires, inclinations and passions.

Conversion, as now defined, is not an instantaneous act of the mind, but a gradual process. To demand that every true Christian must know the place and the hour where and when he was converted, would therefore be like demanding of every grown man that he should know where and when he passed from a state of unconsciousness to consciousness. Every one who has attained to a state of consciousness is aware of the fact,

though he cannot trace the steps or degrees through which he passed in attaining to this state. So every converted Christian will and must know that he is converted, though he may not be able to tell when and where this came to pass. Every one can know whether he is truly and sincerely penitent on account of sin, and whether he truly and sincerely renounces the world, the flesh, and the devil; and every one can know whether he truly and sincerely believes in "God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and in Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son," &c. And whoever is truly penitent and truly believing, is converted, whether he knows when and where he became so or not. There must be a time, of course, where the process becomes complete, and where then it passes over into the other process of sanctification, but if the process has been at all normal, no one will be able to tell that time. The flower opens gradually and slowly; no one can perceive the movement of the sepals and petals as they expand, and yet there must be a time when it may be said that the flower is now fully open. So it is with conversion in its normal process. If in any case it be sudden and abrupt, it is also abnormal. Thus it will always be, of course, where the process is hindered in its progress by adverse influences. If a man were born blind, and if then, when he is of full age, his eyes were opened by a surgical operation or by a miracle, the development of his sense of vision would, of course, be comparatively sudden, and he would be able to tell something about it. But that is not the normal way of the development of the perceptive faculties; nor is it the normal way of the development of faith. It will, however, always be the way more or less in the case of persons who, instead of being brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, are left to grow up in ignorance of the Gospel and in the service of sin, and who then lead a careless and ungodly life, until they are arrested by some special providence, or some miracle of grace, that causes them to "come to themselves," and to say with the prodigal that had squandered his substance, "I will arise and will go to my father, and will say, Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight." Cases

of this kind will, of course, always occur ; but to make these the rule, and to suppose that it is necessary for all the children of the Church to have been prodigals before they can become saints, as Methodism virtually does, we think, would be like insisting that all men ought to be born blind and remain so until they are of full age in order that then they may have a lively sense of the joy of receiving sight. We regard this sentiment, which however prevails widely at the present time, as exceedingly pernicious in its effects upon the interests of Christianity and the Church. Who can tell how many children of the Church are lost in consequence of it ? There are members of the Church enough everywhere, who, while pretending to superior piety themselves, make no effort to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, assuming that, although they may be baptized, they are still no better than heathen, and indeed can be no better until they are old enough to be converted and "get religion," which may all be brought to pass, if things go well, in the brief space of some winter's night. We regard this notion as one of the many delusions of Satan, by which the Church is afflicted at the present time, and against which we of the Reformed Church are bound, now as well as in the past, to bear our solemn testimony.

ART. IX.--THE FORGIVENESS OF SIN.

A GOOD deal has been said by those in the Reformed Church, who are opposed to its reigning theology, in regard to a lecture of Dr. Harbaugh, on "The Church Doctrine of the Forgiveness of Sin," published in the January number of this Review for the year 1868. It seems, that some of the statements contained in this lecture had found their way to some of these opponents of the theology taught in our Seminary, before it was published, and use was made of them to prejudice the minds of the people. It was said, that the Professors in our Seminary taught that no one can have an assurance of pardon, except through the absolution of the minister; that this was Romanism, &c., &c. In order to correct these misrepresentations, the lecture itself was published in this Review after Dr. Harbaugh's death. It was thought that its publication would silence these defamers. But such was not the effect. This continues to be the chief objection, urged by the party referred to, to the teachings of the Seminary. It is the only article, against which these attacks are made.

Now we desire to bring before the readers of the Review once more, what Dr. Harbaugh's lecture really did contain. Upon turning to that lecture, it will be found, that one main point in it is, that forgiveness of sin is to be obtained *in*, not *outside of*, the Church. "The sentiment is common—but as it is common, so is it false—that the forgiveness of sin is to be obtained outside of and separate from the Church, and without its intervention—and that this boon is to be enjoyed before the Church is entered. Where this idea is held, it is supposed, that the forgiveness of sin is a gift from the Holy Ghost direct, and without the medium of the Church. In that case the Creed ought to run: 'I believe in the Holy Ghost, the forgiveness of sin.' But it does not so run, &c."

Then come the Scripture passages in support of this general position, and then the two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, are held up as signs and seals of our pardon, according to the teaching of the Reformers, among whom Calvin and Ursinus are quoted. Now comes the language, to which so much objection is made, and which is paraded on all occasions, as an instance of the false teaching in our Seminary. Here it is:

"Without such an act" (as Baptism, to which the author refers in the preceding paragraph,)—"Without such an act, in which our pardon is certified to us, our hearts cannot possess a full and satisfying sense of forgiveness." This is the offending language in one paragraph. It is remarkable how well guarded it is. It does not say, that pardon is conveyed through the Sacraments, but that without them, we "cannot possess a full and satisfying sense of forgiveness." What Reformed teacher can say less?

"A sinner may be penitent for his sins, but until he has received Baptism as God's act of remission to him, he has no true assurance of remission; and when, after baptism, he sins through infirmity, he cannot be sure of pardon till his absolution is spoken, signed and sealed by Christ, by means of a divine act through the Church."

This passage, we believe, is chiefly referred to. The use of the word absolution in the latter clause of the sentence has evidently been understood as meaning the office called absolution in the Liturgy. It is clear, however, that the word is used with no such reference to this particular service. The connection will show this. Substitute the word pardon, and what for many is offensive will be removed. And this is just what is meant, for absolution is pardon; and one reason, perhaps, why this latter word was not used is because it occurs just before in the sentence.

Let us look further into this matter. The illustration brought forward in the succeeding portion of the paragraph is that of the Prodigal Son. The design of the passage is to show how a baptized child, who, like the Prodigal Son, has wandered away from God, and is brought to return in the way

of penitence, is to receive the assurance of pardoned sin. We have a picture of this return. "Make room for him at My table, and let him eat of the body of My beloved Son, and tell him it was broken for him; give him of the cup, and tell him it is the New Testament in His blood, which was shed for him for the remission of sins. Say this to him as from Me. Thy sins, which are many, are all forgiven thee! Then there is joy in the house. Then there is joy among the angels. Then there is joy in the penitent's own heart."

Who cannot see the purport of all this? And who can find fault with it, but those, who themselves have fallen away from the Sacramental views of the Heidelberg Catechism? And just here is the trouble with the opposition to the teachings of our Seminary. Much of it is made up of elements, that are not genuine Reformed. Such views as that of the *Mystical Union* of the believer with Christ is repudiated. From this standpoint then, they condemn the views of the Church.

In regard to this matter of the assurance of forgiveness of sin, there is much confusion in the thinking of many, and it is a good point, therefore, to use to shake the position especially of such as are weak. It is caricatured somewhat thus: "Behold these Romanizers! they teach that you cannot have assurance of sin unless some minister, as the Romish priest, speak an absolution over you. You cannot go into your closet and confess your sins to God, and receive assurance of pardon through His Spirit, but you must hear some minister's word before you can feel assured."

A great truth is here caricatured. No one questions, that every believer, every time he prays, no matter where, can have this assurance, and that it is spoken directly by the Holy Spirit in his heart. Though the believer stands related to Christ through, or in, the Church, yet his union is, at the same time, direct and immediate; for Christ is in the Church. But now, it must not be forgotten, the Holy Spirit does not reveal independently of Christ and His means of grace.

Suppose some person should say to these objectors: "I can have assurance of sin through the Holy Spirit without baptism;

therefore, there is no use of baptism." Would they not say: "The Holy Spirit will not confirm assurance to you, except through the means divinely ordained?" And yet this is just what is here contended for.

That comfort and assurance which the believer has, wherever and whenever he prays, rests, after all, not upon a direct revelation of the Spirit, apart from the means of grace. Our forgiveness is signed and sealed, according to the Heidelberg Catechism, in our baptism, and after baptism, we have pardon sealed to us also in the Lord's Supper, and by the word of Christ through His minister. He who denies this has departed from the Reformed faith. Let us hear no more in regard to this awful heresy of the forgiveness of sin. The misrepresentation is too clear to deceive any thinking person.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

EVOLUTION OF LIFE. By Henry C. Chapman, M. D., Member of the Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1873.

This work is published by the same house that published the work of Dr. Büchner, which we noticed in the last number of this Review. It is published in the same substantial, elegant style, and its theory is in close sympathy with that of Dr. Büchner. The author aims to simplify, popularize and enforce Darwinianism. The book contains chapters on Zoology, Botany, Geology, Embryology, Natural Selection, Anthropology. Apart from the horrid theory which it advocates, "that man has descended from an animal; that the remote progenitor of man was an ape, resembling the Gorilla and Chimpanzee, &c.," there is much in the work that is of real interest to the naturalist. It has a map, called a "Hypothetical Sketch of the Monophylitic Origin and of the Diffusion of the twelve varieties of Men from Lemuria over the earth," besides a large number of excellent illustrations.

SERMONS ON LIVING SUBJECTS. By Horace Bushnell. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1872.

The subjects are: 1. Mary, the Mother of Jesus, Luke i. 28; 2. Loving God is but letting God love us, 1 John iv. 16; 3. Feet

and Wings, Ezek. i. 24; 4. The Gospel of the Face, 2 Cor. iv. 6; 5. The Completing of the Soul, Col. ii. 10; 6. The Immediate Knowledge of God, 1 Cor. xv. 34; 7. Religious Nature and Religious Character, Acts xvii. 27; 8. The Property Right we are to get in Souls, 2 Cor. xii. 14; 9. The Dissolving of Doubts, Daniel v. 16; 10. Christ Regenerates even the Desires, Mark x. 35; 11. A Single Trial better than many, Heb. ix. 27; 12. Self-examination examined, Ps. xxvi. 2; 13. How to be a Christian in Trade, Matt. xxv. 16; 14. In and by things temporal are given things eternal, 2 Cor. iv. 18; 15. God organizing in the Church His Eternal Society, Heb. xii. 22-3; 16. Routine Observance indispensable, Matt. vi. 11; 17. Our Advantage in being finite, Heb. ii. 7; 18. The Outside Saints, Acts x. 34-5; 19. Free to Amusements, and too free to want them, 1 Cor. x. 27; 20. The Military Discipline, 2 Tim. ii. 3-4; 21. The Coronation of the Lamb, Rev. xxii. 1; 22. Our Relations to Christ in the Future Life, 1 Cor. xv. 28.

We have thought, that the most satisfactory notice of this book from Dr. Bushnell, who is so well-known to the readers of this Review, would be the giving of its contents. The reader can best judge from this, whether he desires the work or not. We need not add, that these sermons are written in Dr. Bushnell's usual vigorous and fresh style. He is an eminent and profound thinker, and ranks among the first theologians of this country.

FOUR PHASES OF MORALS. SOCRATES, ARISTOTLE, CHRISTIANITY, UTILITARIANISM. By John Stuart Blackie, F. R. S. E., Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 654 Broadway. 1872.

So far as we have examined this work, we have found it interesting and profitable. The sketches of the lives and teachings of Socrates and Aristotle are given in a fresh and masterly way. The author gives evidence of a good acquaintance with these philosophers and their systems. His treatment of Christianity is from the stand-point of Christian faith. Christianity is not merely a system of morals among others, but it is a religion which presents the only authoritative and absolute system of morality. Utilitarianism, as advocated from Locke to Mill and Bain in England, is handled with the severity it deserves. Altogether we can commend the healthy tone which pervades this work. As a popular presentation of the subjects discussed, it is successful.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, AS SET FORTH IN THE BOOK OF CONCORD, CRITICALLY EXAMINED, AND ITS FALLACY DEMONSTRATED. By Rev. J. B. Gross. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1873.

It is not every man's calling to write on this subject. No subject has been so ably discussed by the most learned theologians in dif-

ferent ages. We do not see, that Mr. Gross gives us anything new. His argument, that, in the Aramaic, the language in which Christ is said to have spoken on the occasion of instituting the Supper, there is no verb to express "signifies," has been answered over and over again. The Greek is the only inspired language in the New Testament for us. We must abide by that, and the verb *is*, enters into the language of institution.

The author calls the Lord's Supper, "The mnemonic institution!" He says in a note, "The so-called sacramental consecration in the Christian Church is entirely abnormal and unwarranted, and is an idolatrous blessing of the elements instead of God." And yet St. Paul says, "The cup of blessing *which we bless, &c.*" Calvinism is as bad in the author's view as Lutheranism. "The Calvinistic view of the Lord's Supper tends to schism no less than the dogma of the Real Presence; for its basis is as little scriptural, while its import is no less unintelligible." He thinks the doctrine of the real presence is the cause of the schism in the Protestant Church. Finally, the book winds up with a patriotic appeal for *our country*, and the patriotic hymn, "My country 'tis of thee, Sweet land of liberty." A singular ending of a treatise on the Lord's Supper.

THE ENGLISH IN IRELAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By James Anthony Froude, M. A. In two volumes. Vol. I. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1873.

This first volume contains 637 pages, and is published in handsome style. Mr. Froude's merits and demerits as a historian are pretty well known. His history of Ireland in relation to England is designed to correct what he regards as a wrong sentiment on the subject, especially in this country. His history of Henry VIII did, we confess, somewhat change our estimate of that uxorious king; but we think Mr. Froude's portraiture is one sided. No one, however, will complain that Froude is sluggish or dull.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY. By Charles Hodge, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey. Vol. III. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. London and Edinburgh: T. Nelson & Sons. 1873.

This volume brings Dr. Hodge's great work to its conclusion. It treats of Soteriology and Eschatology. It must be confessed, that Dr. Hodge, in the production of this work, takes his place among the great theologians of the age. His system we regard as belonging to the past rather than to the present. His criticism of the latest and best theology of Germany, it seems to us, reveals an utter inability to comprehend either German philosophy or German theology. We believe Dr. Hodge has honestly done his best to represent Dr. Nevin fairly. That he has seriously misrepresented

him is his misfortune, not a willful fault. Let us just refer to one example taken from page 20. Quoting from Dr. Nevin's *Essay on the Moral Order of Sex*, in the *Mercersburg Review* for 1850, where Dr. Nevin is speaking of the intimate relation between man and nature, the following language occurs: "The world, in its lower view, is not simply the outward theatre or stage on which man is to act his part as a candidate for heaven. In the midst of all its different forms of existence, it is pervaded throughout with the power of a single life, which comes ultimately to its full sense and force only in the human person." So far Dr. Nevin. Now let us see Dr. Hodge's comment. "The world, therefore, is pervaded by 'the power of a single life;' the highest form of that life (on earth) is man. What is that life? What is that pervading principle which reveals itself in such manifold forms of existence, and culminates in man? It is, of course, God." Then the author goes on to speak of the pantheism in all this. The pupils of Dr. Nevin would be surprised to find any one charging Pantheism on such language. But Dr. Hodge puts his meaning into it. He says the life of the world is God. Dr. Nevin does not say that, nor does he mean it.

On page 655, Dr. Hodge publishes a note, which we presume is designed to be a sort of explanation or apology for having appeared to misrepresent Dr. Nevin in his second volume. Dr. Hodge here disavows any intention to charge upon Dr. Nevin Hegelianism or a denial of Christ's proper divinity. The difficulty with Dr. Hodge all along has been, that he jumbles in one mass Hegel, Schleiermacher, Nevin, as though they stood in one school, and that a Pantheistic school. Now the truth is, that Dr. Nevin, in all his articles, has taken pains to disavow anything like a wholesale endorsement of Hegel in philosophy, or Schleiermacher in theology. But he does pay respect to their great thoughts. In the article on Liebner's Christology from which Dr. Hodge quotes, Dr. Nevin says: "It comes to nothing, that such deep and earnest thinkers are found to deviate here and there from the established orthodoxy of their time, that they are chargeable with great and serious errors, and that it is not safe to follow them blindly in their theological speculations. We know well enough, that it is not safe to follow any leader blindly, whether he be an original thinker or an easy traditionist who never thinks at all. That is not the question. We know, too, that Schleiermacher has fallen into serious errors, etc." Surely that does not sound like one, who could be regarded as standing in the school of either Hegel or Schleiermacher. We have found other minds besides Dr. Hodge, who never could understand the German modes of thought. The first principles are strange and new to one educated in the English or Scotch order of philosophic thought.

But we wish here to bear our testimony to the ability of Dr. Hodge's work in its own sphere. It is certainly one of the greatest theological works ever brought out in this country. It is written

in a calm, clear and forcible style. It is a monument to the ability and untiring industry of one of the great theological instructors of this country. May the evening of life be calm and serene for the venerable author, and when his work on earth is ended, may he still live in the lives and labors of the large number whom he has aided in preparing for the holy ministry!

THE WONDERS OF THE MOON. From the French of Amedee Guillemin. By Miss M. G. Mead. Edited by Miss Maria Mitchell of Vassar College. Scribner, Armstrong & Co., New York. 1872.

ALSO THE WONDERS OF ELECTRICITY. From the French of J. Baile. Edited, with numerous additions, by Dr. J. W. Armstrong. Scribner, Armstrong & Co., New York. 1872.

The Messrs. Scribner, Armstrong & Co., are at present publishing an Illustrated Library of Wonders of Nature and Science, of which we have elegant copies before us. The title of the series might lead to the impression, that these works now in course of publication are to be mainly of a sensational character, and consequently fragmentary and deficient in thoroughness. Judging from the volumes before us, we are happy in saying, that such does not seem to be the case. So far as they are sensational, and we admit that they are sensational in a good sense, is owing to the particularly interesting subjects of which they treat, and the happy manner in which they are written and illustrated. They illustrate the old saying, that truth is stranger than fiction. Whilst they are prepared for the general reader, and those who have no time to peruse abstruse works, they are, at the same time, sufficiently exhaustive, without being tedious. The volume which treats of the Moon, describes everything that is important, interesting or reliable in regard to our satellite, in a clear, lucid and interesting style. It is an admirable monograph on that subject, to which all persons alike may refer with profit and pleasure. We can with truth apply the same remarks also to the work on Electricity. These works, we think, should find a place in our libraries generally, especially in the libraries of our colleges, of our district and high schools. They deserve also to be introduced into our families, where they might perform an important service, in supplanting many books, whose chief merits consist in being written for popular effect.

GANOT'S NATURAL PHILOSOPHY FOR GENERAL READERS AND YOUNG PERSONS. Translated from the French and edited by E. Atkinson. Published by D. Appleton & Co., New York. 1872. pp. 522.

Ganot's Physics scarcely needs any further recommendation from the public press. It has already been introduced into a number of our colleges and high schools as a text book, and has received

the commendation of our best teachers. It is a successful attempt at elucidating the phenomena of the different departments of Natural Philosophy, without having recourse to mathematical reasoning, which is not always appreciated by the general reader. It is fully up to the times, and gives in a clear and popular style the latest results of scientific inquiry. A large part of the book is taken up in considering the phenomena of light, heat and electricity, those mysterious agencies in nature, which, perhaps more than any others, are at the present time engaging the diligent study of scientific men. By numerous and admirable illustrations, these subjects are very much simplified in this book and made intelligible to ordinary readers. The book, however, is one that deserves careful study, and is well adapted to schools of all grades. As a text book in district and high schools, we consider it one of the best in the market.

ELEMENTS OF ASTRONOMY. By J. Norman Lockyer, Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society, etc. Published by D. Appleton & Co., New York. 1871. pp. 312.

This is an excellent and interesting book. It comes from a living, active astronomer, of well established reputation both in this country and in England. It has, therefore, about it the air of freshness and originality, which we do not expect to see in a mere compilation. It is in various respects in advance of the text books that are now generally in use. Its most marked peculiarity consists in the fact, that the author commences his subject by introducing the reader at once to the consideration of the universe as a whole, and then bringing him down to the solar system and landing safely on *terra firma* at the end of his journey, instead of considering the earth first and then afterwards carrying him out and losing him in the regions of the nebulae and fixed stars. Both methods have their advantages.

The author discards the old parallax of the sun, and adopts a new one, which changes the distances of the earth and planets from the sun considerably. It is generally conceded, that the old estimate made out in 1769, is slightly in error; but, as we understand, the error will not be correctly ascertained until the next transit of Venus over the sun, which is announced to take place in 1874, and for observations in regard to which, extensive preparations are already being made in both hemispheres.

We commend this book highly as embodying in a small space a large amount of reliable astronomical knowledge. It is adapted for schools of all grades, as well as for the general reader. We are informed, that it has been introduced as one of the text books in Astronomy in Franklin and Marshall College.